UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
LIBRARY

Class 332.1
Book G371
Volume 5

Ja 09-20M

ECONOMICS
DEPARTMENT

UNIVERSITY OF
ILLINOIS LIBRARY
AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
STACKS

DP-2

HERTZBERG — NEW METHOD, INC. EAST VANDALIA ROAD, JACKSONVILLE, ILL. 62650

6RUN-- TITLE NO.	ACCOUNT NO.	LOT AND TICKET NO.
G-0340.6000	07200-Z51	JC 00- 1 S1

??-?? GILBART * ??-?? WORKS * (7200)

(M-SET)

43-24 5*LECTURES*AND*ESSAYS*
42-28 332.1*G371*

V.5* (PHASE BOX DO NO CLAM SHELL*) 01STX4

CLOTH COLOR HEIGHT

0091 VERY BRITTLE PLEASE PHASE BOX* 00

CHARGING INFORMATION SPECIAL WORK AND PREP.

STUBBING		FRONT COVER		HAND ADHESIVE		MAP POCKET PAPER	
HAND SEW		NO TRIM		LENGTHWISE		MAP POCKET CLOTH	
THRU SEW		PAGES LAMINATED		FOREIGN TITLE		SPECIAL WORK	
THRU SEW ON TAPE		EXTRA THICKNESS		LINES OF LETTERING		REMOVE TATTLE TAPE	

HEIGHT	PICA	WRAP
8 7/8	10	

6RUN--

251-1

THE WORKS OF

JAMES WILLIAM GILBART, F.R.S.

IN SIX VOLUMES.

VOL. V.

LECTURES AND ESSAYS.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign Alternates

https://archive.org/details/worksofjameswill05gilb

LECTURES

AND

ESSAYS.

BY THE LATE

JAMES WILLIAM GILBART, F.R.S.,

ONE OF THE DIRECTORS OF THE LONDON AND WESTMINSTER BANK, AND FORMERLY GENERAL MANAGER.

LONDON:

BELL & DALDY, 186, FLEET STREET;

AND 6, YORK STREET, COVENT GARDEN.

1865.

332.1
G371
5

NOTICE.

The executors of the late Mr. Gilbart, in placing before the public a reprint of his works, deem it right to state, that no alterations have been made in the original text, beyond the correction of dates and the omission of some obsolete matter; but that the works are issued in accordance with the provisions of his will, and remain as they were left by the author.

CONTENTS OF VOL. V.

LECTURES ON THE HISTORY AND PRINCIPLES OF ANCIENT COMMERCE 1

THE SOCIAL EFFECTS OF THE REFORMATION 145

THE PREACHER, OR ESSAYS ON PREACHING 225

WITH AN APPENDIX ON THE DELIVERY OF

ADDRESSES FROM THE PLATFORM 307

THE PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY 347

148325

LECTURES

ON THE

HISTORY AND PRINCIPLES OF ANCIENT COMMERCE.

PREFACE.*

An Author who writes a Preface to a book he had written fourteen years before, labours under some disadvantages, inasmuch as the usual topics of a Preface—the reasons which induced him to fix upon his subject, the manner in which he pursued his inquiries, the sources from which he gathered his information, and the mental process by which he arrived at his opinions—have probably passed from his recollection. On the other hand, he has some advantages. Time has sobered his feelings, and possibly improved his judgment. He approaches his work with somewhat of the feelings of a stranger. He is less likely to speak with fondness of his own performance, and is less sanguine as to the degree of approbation it will receive from others.

These Lectures were delivered at Waterford, in the beginning of the year 1833. At that time I held the office of Manager of the Waterford Branch of the Provincial Bank of Ireland. When residing in London, I had assisted at the formation of the City of London Literary and Scientific Institution, and was a member of the first Committee of Management, in the year 1825. At my suggestion, an institution somewhat similar was formed at Waterford: and, as professional lecturers were not to be obtained, some of those

* The Original Preface to the unpublished Edition.

gentlemen who had taken an active part in its formation, and others connected with scientific pursuits, consented to become lecturers.

The example was set by the President, Thomas Wyse, Esq., M.P., who in his own locality showed the same zeal in the cause of education which has characterized his public exertions. A portion of my own labours in this way consisted of the following lectures, on the History and Principles of Ancient Commerce. At the close of the session Mr. Wyse delivered an address to the members, in which he made the following allusions to these lectures. That no undue responsibility may rest on Mr. Wyse, it is proper to state that he never read the lectures, but formed his judgment from having been present at their delivery :—

"But this was only a small portion of Mr. Gilbart's important services. You have already heard me refer, in terms of merited eulogium, to the active part which he bore in the founding of our institution—an activity exceeded, if possible, by the intelligence, assiduity, and perseverance which he brought to its subsequent management;—but, great as these contributions undoubtedly were, they were fully rivalled by his zealous literary support. There are few in this room who have not attended his excellent lectures on 'Ancient Commerce.' I feel what a train of agreeable and elevating associations I excite by merely mentioning their name. The judicious arrangement, the happy spirit of analysis, the discriminating selection and classification of facts, the wise deduction of principles, leading to views the noblest and loftiest, but at the same time the most practical and useful to society—all this, too, conveyed in language claiming the applause of the instructed, but not beyond the grasp of the ignorant—was not only a complete redemption of our original promises, but I do think, the best practical illustration and most complete recommendation we could

possibly offer of the pleasures and utilities of such institutions as this."

Soon after the delivery of these lectures I was called to a position that led me to forego most of my literary amusements, and to direct my nightly studies into the same channel as my daily labours. But having been relieved, by the settlement of the law, of a portion of this kind of study, I was induced to review the recreations of former years; and, on reading these lectures, I deemed them not unworthy of being committed to the press. The facts and principles are not matters of local or temporary interest: if they possess any interest, they possess as much now as they did fourteen years ago; and they will possess as much fourteen years hence as they do now. I need hardly say that lectures delivered in the year 1833 do not contain any comments upon acts of Parliament passed in the year 1846.

The lectures were delivered from notes, and were not wholly written out until afterwards. In preparing the manuscript for the press, I have omitted some anecdotes introduced with the view to enliven the discussion; some local illustrations, taken from the trade of Waterford, and some matters connected with the antiquities of Egypt, Greece, and Rome, not bearing so directly upon commerce. On the other hand, I have made a number of small additions, but none that alter either the principles or the structure of the lectures.

Lectures are one of the most efficient means of public instruction. A lecturer may present a better view of a subject than can be found in any book, as his lectures may be derived from a variety of books, and from other sources; he can impart instruction to a great number of people at the same time, and his instructions may partake very much of the character of amusement. "There is something," says Dr. Watts, "more delightful and entertaining in the living

discourse of a wise, a learned, and a well-qualified teacher, than there is in the silent and sedentary practice of reading. The very turn of voice and good pronunciation, and the polite and alluring manners which some teachers have attained, will engage the attention, keep the soul fixed, and convey and insinuate into the mind the ideas of things in a more lively and forcible way than the mere reading of books in the silence and retirement of the closet." It may be stated, too, that a lecture is a social means of diffusing knowledge. It brings together the aged and the young, and enables the female part of the community to participate in the gratification. It affords matter for subsequent conversation, and tends to promote friendly and social intercourse.

All who are intrusted with the management of Literary and Scientific Institutions are impressed with the importance of lectures. I believe experience will testify that whenever acceptable courses of lectures have been maintained, the institution has flourished, and whenever these have been neglected, the institution has declined. The lectures often are the means of supporting the library, as they create a desire of reading, and produce in the minds of the auditors a disposition to avail themselves of every other means of instruction.

On these grounds it seems desirable that in smaller towns, where funds to establish a large library cannot be easily obtained, or where the necessity for one is not supposed to exist, that societies should be formed for the sole purpose of supporting lectures. A public room may in general be obtained, free of expense, and some of the educated inhabitants may be induced to become lecturers. The funds of such society would be applied almost exclusively in purchasing instruments for illustrating the lectures. The society would not clash with any book-societies or circulating libraries previously in existence, and it would be a source of instruction

and entertainment, especially during the winter season, to all classes of the inhabitants. Some years ago it was said, "The schoolmaster is abroad;" is it not time it should be said, "The lecturer is abroad?"

It is not, however, probable that any society which depends entirely upon *honorary* lecturers will continue in existence above two or three years. And hence I am led to think, that if it be an admitted principle that the expense of public education should in some degree be defrayed by the State, then its patronage should not be confined to schoolmasters, but a portion should be extended to lecturers. This may be advocated upon the grounds, that the elementary knowledge given in schools is now generally supplied by private benevolence,—that lecturing is a more efficient mode of public instruction,—that it stimulates and promotes all other means of obtaining knowledge,—and that it is adapted to the middle as well as to the lower classes of society. Upon the latter point I will quote the following language from the address of Mr. Wyse:—"Scientific and literary societies form a very important branch of public education—that branch which most directly refers to the most important class in the community, the middle and professional—that branch which calls into action or supplies the place of the most useful portion of human knowledge—that which lies between elementary on one side, and superior or university education on the other. If education, then, be at all to be encouraged, if in any departments promoted, I know of no one department which more eminently demands and rewards such encouragement than that to which I have just now referred."

The system adopted by that respectable body, the Wesleyan Methodists, with regard to their preachers, may teach us how a college of lecturers may be organized so as to supply the means of knowledge to every part of the country. The whole kingdom is divided into districts, called circuits. To each of

these circuits from two to four or five preachers are assigned, who travel in succession to all the towns and village in the district, preaching twice every Sunday, and several evenings in the week. These travelling preachers are assisted by the gratuitous services of local preachers, who are generally persons engaged in secular occupations. Why could not a plan somewhat similar be adopted with regard to the teachers of literary and scientific knowledge? Might not two or three professors be stationed in each of our county towns, and visit periodically the smaller towns in the district,—and might they not engage local lecturers to visit the neighbouring villages? If the lecturers were provided at the Government expense, the people would readily find lecture-rooms and audiences, and thus a stimulus would be given to the public mind, and the means of instruction would be permanently afforded to our agricultural, manufacturing, and mining population.

The establishment of a college of lecturers would not interfere with nor supersede any other means the Government may think proper to employ for the instruction of the people, while it would be free from those objections by which they are assailed. No religious body could object to a lecturer, appointed by the Government, giving lectures in their schoolrooms once or twice a week upon branches of literature or science, wholly unconnected with either politics or theology. Such a measure, too, would probably lead to an improvement in the lecturers themselves. As the most learned theologian is not always the most popular preacher, so the most profound philosopher is not always the best lecturer. The talent for discovering or acquiring knowledge is distinct from the talent for communicating it. The art of lecturing is an art in itself. If public lecturers were appointed, they would study that kind of composition adapted for instruction—would endeavour to acquire some of the graces of

oratory—and would improve themselves by constant practice. We have training-establishments for schoolmasters and schoolmistresses, why not for lecturers? It may be worthy the consideration of those who have the management of our literary and scientific institutions whether they should not take steps for bringing this subject under the consideration of the Government.

This book is not published, but is printed chiefly to enable me to present copies to my friends. I hope it will be useful to those who are young, and not uninteresting to those who are no longer young. To myself it will furnish a memorial of my performances as a lecturer—a character in which I never appeared before, and in which I shall never appear again. It will also bring to my recollection some very agreeable associations connected with the period when the lectures were delivered. When the hand of Time compels one to look back upon the past, one feels less pleasure in surveying the fields of even honourable and successful controversy, than in viewing those seasons in which, on however limited a stage, and for however short a period, one has contributed to the promotion of peace and good-will among men.

J. W. G.

London, March 10, 1847.

LECTURES, &c.

LECTURE I.

THE COMMERCE OF ANCIENT EGYPT.

Origin of Commerce. History of Egypt. Productions—Corn—Linen—Horses—Paper. Consumption—Food—Dress—Houses—Embalming. Situation—Trade with the Phœnicians — Judea — Arabia — India. Means of Communication—Roads—Canals—Ships. Arts and Sciences —Geometry—Computation—Money. Commercial Laws—Tenure of Land—Castes—Female Traders—Imprisonment for Debt—Trial after Death. Commercial Character of the Egyptians.

You have already been informed that the present course of lectures will be upon the History of Ancient Commerce. It occurred to me that I could not fix upon a subject more important or more interesting. We are indebted to commerce for a vast portion of the comforts we possess. Many articles of our food, the materials of our clothing, the timber with which we construct our habitations, the various luxuries of life, and the medicines which save us from death, are, for the most part, the productions of foreign lands.

Providence has appointed that the different countries of the world should have different climates; should have a variety of soils; should be capable of producing different kinds of vegetable and animal substances; and should contain beneath their surface, metals and minerals of various kinds. Had the world been differently constituted, did each country possess the same length of day and night, the same degree of heat and cold, the same kind of soil, the same ap-

pearances on its surface, and yield, in every respect, the same kind of productions, there would be no commerce between the different portions of the globe. Each country would possess in itself every kind of commodity that existed in the world. It could not receive anything which it did not previously enjoy, nor could it give in exchange anything but what the other party had already in possession. But in consequence of the various climates and peculiarities of different countries, and the consequent variety in the nature of their productions, mankind have the strongest inducement to promote intercourse with each other.

By means of this intercourse, every country can obtain the productions of all the other countries in the world, while the superfluous productions of each country acquire a value from their capability of purchasing the productions of other countries. Hence the happiness of all is increased. One country may have a superabundant quantity of the materials for building; another country may have a superabundant quantity of the materials for clothing. Now, if no communication takes place between these two countries, the inhabitants of one country may be well lodged, but badly clothed; and the inhabitants of the other country may be well clothed, but badly lodged. But let these two countries exchange their superfluous productions with each other, and the people of both countries will be well lodged and well clothed. Almost every nation either has naturally, or produces by its own labour, some production in greater quantity than is necessary for its own consumption. This superabundant quantity, when kept at home, possesses no value. Of what use would it be to Norway to keep possession of all her forests; to Sweden, to retain all the metals in her mines; or to America, to keep to herself her cotton; or to India, her silk? These commodities, the superabundance of which would be useless at home, are given to other countries, to whom they are valuable. And, by all countries acting upon the same principle, the convenience and happiness of all nations are greatly promoted.

Commerce has also a claim on our consideration, from its

being friendly to civilization. Commerce gives a rapid circulation to the valuable discoveries of science and of art. Whatever useful discoveries are made in any science; whatever new machines are invented; whatever new remedies for maladies are found out; they are quickly, by means of an extended commercial intercourse, circulated all over the world. It is chiefly by means of commerce that barbarous nations have become civilized. The most commercial nations have always been civilized nations. In the pursuit of commercial objects they have sought out new nations with whom to trade. They have discovered nations in a state of comparative barbarism, and by their commercial intercourse civilization has been extended. Commerce has laid the foundation of the most powerful empires. They have flourished as their commerce has flourished; and when their commerce has declined, they have fallen into obscurity.

The mighty influence of commerce to promote the wealth of nations and of individuals has, in every age, induced some men of wisdom and talent to endeavour to unfold the principles on which it is founded; to trace the causes of its prosperity, and notice the occasions of its decline. In our own times, books published upon the subject have abundantly increased. Commerce is now not merely followed as a profession, it is studied as a science; and, even at our universities, professors are appointed, who deliver lectures upon the principles of commerce.

The subject of the present lecture is the History of Commerce, as it existed among the ancient Egyptians.

Soon after the Deluge, which took place in the year 1656 from the creation of the world, the different branches of the family of Noah separated, and took possession of various parts of the earth as their inheritance. The family of Shem went to the eastern part of Asia, while Noah himself is supposed to have gone still further east, and to have founded the kingdom of China. The family of Ham settled in Asia Minor, and extended to Africa, while the family of Japhet took possession of Europe.

Egypt was founded by Mizraim, the son of Ham, soon

after Nimrod had founded the kingdom of Babylon, about 2,200 years before the Christian era. In the year 538 (B.C.) the Babylonian monarchy was subverted by Cyrus the Great, and thirteen years afterwards his son conquered Egypt. Egypt had thus continued an independent kingdom for nearly seventeen hundred years. Notwithstanding several revolts, the Egyptians continued to be subject to the Persians, until that monarchy was overturned by Alexander the Great. On the death of Alexander, which took place in the year 324 before the Christian era, his kingdom was divided, and Ptolemy Lagus took possession of Egypt. It now again became an independent kingdom. But the monarch and the principal men in the country were Greeks, and his soldiers were Greeks. Hence this monarchy is distinguished from the former one, by being called the Greco-Egyptian Monarchy.

This monarchy continued for about 300 years, when it was overturned by the Romans, and Egypt became a province of the Roman Empire. It is not necessary for my present purpose that I should trace the history of Egypt any further. You perceive, then, that for 1,700 years Egypt was an independent monarchy; then for 200 years it was under the yoke of the Persians; then for 300 years it was an independent monarchy, with a Greek monarch: and this brings down the history of Egypt to the commencement of the Christian era, about which time it was conquered by the Romans.

My lecture this evening will refer to the first period of 1,700 years, when Egypt was an independent monarchy. Scanty, indeed, are the materials we possess for a history of commerce during that period. We have not a single book, or manuscript, written by an Egyptian author. With the exception of the intimations that occur in the sacred volume, all our knowledge of Egypt, during that period, is derived from Greek authors, who had visited Egypt for the purpose of acquiring knowledge. And even those writers, like other historians, take very little notice of the affairs of commerce. Had all our writers of history traced the origin of distinct branches of trade, as faithfully as they have traced the rise of the different wars—had they described the operations of

traffic with as much minuteness as they have described battles and sieges; and had they been as anxious to transmit to posterity the names of those who have enriched their country by the extension of its commerce, as the names of those who have distinguished themselves by the death of millions of their fellow-creatures, the study of history would be far more instructive, and certainly not less entertaining than it is at present.

I have already observed that commerce is now not merely followed as a profession, but is studied as a science. In lecturing upon the history of Egyptian commerce, I shall endeavour to combine the facts of history with the principles of the science, so as to render the one illustrative of the other. I observe, then,—

First—That the commerce of a country depends upon its productions.

If a country produces everything the inhabitants desire, it will import nothing; and if it produces nothing which is wanted by other countries, it can export nothing. Its productions will regulate its exports.

Let us take a view of the productions of ancient Egypt.

With regard to mines, Egypt had none. But it had quarries of excellent marble, though we do not read of its being exported; possibly other nations had sufficient of their own. As to fisheries, Egypt had abundance. But fresh fish cannot be exported to a great distance; and it is not known whether the art of curing them, as practised in modern times, was then discovered.

Of vegetable substances, grain was abundant. For many ages Egypt was the granary of surrounding nations. Though the land was naturally barren, yet, by the annual overflowing of the Nile, it could produce two, and sometimes three crops a year. Egypt also produced an abundance of excellent vegetables; onions, in particular, were highly prized. Of timber it was barren—it had no forests. It had but few fruit-trees—no vineyards, and of course no wine. The annual overflowing of the Nile, though useful in supplying a soil for the cultivation of grain, would have destroyed the fruits, and also the pastures.

The annual overflowing of the Nile is caused by the periodical rains in Ethiopia. The river begins to rise in the latter end of June, and attains its utmost height about the middle of August, when Egypt presents the appearance of a vast sea, while the cities and towns appear like so many islands. After this, the waters gradually subside, and about the end of November the river has returned to its ordinary limits. During this period the earth, or mud, which the waters held in solution, has fallen on the soil, and, on the retiring of the waters, the whole land is covered with a rich manure; and, according to Herodotus, required so little cultivation, that, in some cases, it was only necessary that the seed should be thrown upon the surface, and trodden down by pigs.

In animals, Egypt did not abound; and, in some one or other of the provinces, the ox, the sheep, and the goat were held sacred, and hence not used for food. The Egyptians had such an abhorrence of pork, that they would not intermarry with persons engaged in the keeping of pigs. This prejudice arose, probably, in the first instance, from the circumstance that, in that warm climate, the eating of pork was found to produce cutaneous disorders, especially the leprosy. Egypt was remarkable for an excellent race of horses. As Egypt was a level country, horses and chariots were found useful in war, either in quelling civil commotions, or in fighting other nations. In mountainous countries, horses are of less value. Of manufactured commodities, Egypt was remarkable, at an early period, for linen, and, subsequently, for paper. Egypt produced plenty of flax, which was manufactured into linen, of so fine a texture that the threads could not be observed. Their paper was manufactured of the vegetable called the papyrus. Paper made from papyrus was afterwards supplanted by paper made from cotton, and that by paper from linen rags.

The chief exports of Egypt, then, must have been corn, linen, horses, and paper.

We find in Scripture history a variety of intimations respecting the productions of ancient Egypt. The history of

Joseph informs us that all nations went to Egypt to buy CORN. After their departure from Egypt, the Israelites sang of their deliverance from the chariots of Pharaoh, and the horsemen thereof; and we find that Solomon obtained HORSES out of Egypt; from thence, also, his merchants obtained *linen yarn.* When Joseph was appointed prime minister, he was arrayed in vestures of fine *linen.* The garments of the Jewish priests were directed to be made of fine linen; and, as no linen could be obtained in the wilderness, this linen, or the flax from which it was made, must have been brought with them from Egypt. In the time of Solomon, the Jewish ladies decked their beds with tapestry and fine linen of Egypt; and, in later time, the Tyrians are said to have used the fine linen and broidered work of Egypt as sails for their ships.

When the Israelites complained of the manna in the wilderness, they said—"We remember the FISH which we did eat in Egypt freely: the cucumbers, and the melons, and the leeks, and the onions, and the garlick." This shows us that fish and vegetables were abundant in Egypt. On another occasion, they stated, that, when in Egypt, "they sat by the flesh-pots, and eat bread to the full." From the fertility of the soil, bread was, of course, abundant; and, as the Israelites were shepherds, and had many flocks and herds, they had abundance of flesh, and were not, like the Egyptians, compelled to abstain from it upon religious grounds; for the ox was the "abomination"—that is, the god—of the Egyptians.

On the other hand, there are various intimations, in Scripture, of the articles which Egypt did not produce. Joseph's brethren sold him to a company of Ishmaelites, who came from Gilead, with their camels, "bearing spicery, and balm, and myrrh, going to carry it down to Egypt." When Jacob sent his sons to buy corn of Joseph, he said—"Do thus—take the best fruits of the land in your vessels, and carry down the man a present; a little balm, and a little honey, spices, and myrrh, nuts, and almonds." These were articles, which, though abundant in Canaan, were not produced in Egypt; and hence were as suitable a present to the prime minister, as a present of foreign wines, or any other choice foreign

production, would be to an English nobleman in our own times.

Moses, in describing the Land of Promise, uses the following language; and, like a skilful orator, fixes upon those points in which Canaan was superior to Egypt:—"For the land whither thou goest in to possess it is not as the land of Egypt, from whence ye came out. But the land is a land of hills and valleys, and drinketh water of the rain of heaven." "The Lord thy God bringeth thee into a good land, a land of brooks of water, of fountains, and depths that spring out of valleys and hills. A land of wheat, and barley, and vines, and fig-trees, and pomegranates. A land of oil olive and honey. A land wherein thou shalt eat bread without scarceness, thou shalt not lack anything in it. A land whose stones are iron, and out of whose hills thou mayest dig brass." This may be regarded as a negative description of Egypt. The land of Canaan was not, like the land of Egypt, a level country, on which there was no rain, but whose fertility was caused by the overflowing of the river. It was a land of hills and valleys, which drank water of the rain of heaven; it was, also, more picturesque, and afforded everywhere a constant supply of water for themselves and their cattle, for it had brooks of water, and fountains springing out of valleys and hills; it not only produced, like Egypt, wheat and barley, but also vines, and fig-trees, and pomegranates, and oil olive, and honey, which Egypt did not produce; and, moreover, Egypt had no mines of copper or of iron; but this is "a land whose stones are iron, and out of whose hills thou mayest dig brass."

Secondly. We observe, that the commerce of a country depends upon its consumption—its consumption will regulate its imports.

Consumption means use. The consumption of a country means the things which are used in that country. Thus, food, clothes, houses—all things that wear out—are said to be consumed. If those articles are the productions of another country, their consumption promotes commerce.

The Egyptians lived chiefly on a vegetable diet. They

believed in the doctrine of the transmigration of souls; they believed that, after death, the soul passed into the body of a brute, and from that into others, for the course of three thousand years, and then again entered into the body of a man: hence, they avoided eating animal food, lest they should devour the bodies of some of their ancestors. It must be observed, however, that all the Egyptians did not abstain from animal food; there was a great difference of opinion among them on these points. Animals which were not eaten in one province were eaten in another; some would eat no fish, but others ate it freely. As a general rule, however, it may be said that the Egyptians lived chiefly on a vegetable diet. Their drink was chiefly the water of the Nile, which is said to have an excellent taste, and to be very fattening. On their festivals, they drank a kind of liquor, made from barley, probably something like our beer. As they had no vineyards, they drank no wine; indeed, they were taught to believe that wine was the blood of demons. On this subject, Michaelis observes, in his "Commentaries on the Laws of Moses," that the lawgivers of the Egyptians made use of religion to enforce and sanctify those laws which policy counselled, according to the opinions which then prevailed.

"Thus, the preservation of certain animals was necessary to the country; and they, therefore, made them representations of the Deity, or applied to them the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, in order to render them inviolable. Wine was not produced in Egypt in sufficient quantity to be made a daily drink; and to import it into a country is a very hurtful sort of commerce, because it carries money thence to foreign nations. Now what, in such a case, is a legislator to do? Laws against such luxuries as the importation of wine are commonly quite ineffectual. Were such laws to be enacted in Sweden, Denmark, Britain, and the north of Germany, it would, in fact, be only to authorise wine to be drunken without duty; for it would be continually smuggled. The Egyptian lawgivers, therefore, gave out, that wine was an invention of the evil deity. The juice of the grape, however, before it was fermented, was allowed. In this way,

from the few vineyards that Upper Egypt possessed, persons of very high rank might certainly be supplied with must, or fresh grape juice, which we accordingly read of Pharaoh drinking, in Genesis, xl. 11; but neither must nor grapes could be imported in sufficient abundance for universal use."

Their dress, like those of most of the nations of antiquity, consisted of the tunic and the toga. The tunic, or inner garment, was like a frock that countrymen wear over their clothes; it reached to their knees; but it had no sleeves, and was fastened round the waist with a girdle. This garment, among the Romans, was of woollen; but among the Egyptians it was made of linen. The toga, or cloak, was a garment worn over the tunic. It reached to the feet, and was worn various ways, according to the fancy of the wearer. They wore no stockings, but sometimes bound a narrow piece of cloth round the legs. For shoes they wore sandals, which were like the soles of shoes, fastened to the feet by strings, or thongs, tied in front. They had no hat nor cap; but when they wished to cover their head, they brought up the toga over the head, like a hood. The dress of the women resembled that of the men, except that the tunic had sleeves, and reached down to the feet. Hence, it was like a modern gown, except that it was loose, and fastened round the waist with a sash, or girdle, instead of being made to fit the person; and it was worn as an inner garment, instead of an outer one. Women also wore the toga, fastened round the waist with a girdle. These two garments composed the whole of their ordinary dress; for, in warm climates, much clothing is not required. The poorer sort of people wore their toga, or cloak, in its natural colour, without any dyeing; but the wealthier had theirs dyed in various colours: that most highly esteemed was the purple. Hence, an Oriental voluptuary is described, in Scripture, as one who was "clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day." As their garments were made so loose, they fitted every body; and, as the fashions never changed, they might descend from father to son. Persons of rank and wealth kept large wardrobes, and gave changes of raiment to their guests.

Joseph gave to each of his brethren a change of raiment; and to Benjamin, as a mark of peculiar honour, he gave five changes of raiment.

As to their buildings.—Their temples, and the houses of their great men, were built of marble; but the houses of the other classes were built of a brick, made of mud and straw, and hardened in the sun. Their furniture was very scanty; tables and chairs were not wanted. At meals they spread a cloth on the floor, and sat on their heels. In so warm a climate bedding was not necessary; the toga, which served them for a cloak by day, was a quilt at night. With reference to this practice we find the following enactments in the Jewish law: "If thou take at all thy neighbour's raiment to pledge, thou shalt deliver it unto him by that the sun goeth down. For that is his covering: it is his raiment wherein he shall sleep."

You will perceive, from this statement, that nearly all the commodities consumed by the Egyptians, as articles either of food, or clothing, or lodging, were of home produce, and, consequently, did not give rise to any great amount of foreign commerce.

There were, however, some customs among the Egyptians which led to a consumption of foreign commodities; such, for instance, was that of embalming the dead. I have stated that the Egyptians believed in the doctrine of the transmigration of souls. The word transmigration is formed of two Latin words, *trans* and *migro*. *Migro* means to move; *trans* means beyond; transmigrate means to move beyond—to move from one place to another. Hence the transmigration of souls means the removal of souls from one body to another. This doctrine has another hard word—*metempsychosis*. This word is compounded of three Greek words, which, in the order in which they are combined, mean,—again, in, soul—that is, the soul is in again. It is no sooner out of one body than it is into another. The Egyptians believed that on the death of a human being, the soul did not go into the body of a brute until the body had begun to decay—hence they embalmed it. The process of embalming consisted in in-

troducing drugs and spices into the interior of the body. It was placed in a solution of saltpetre for between two and three months. It was then taken out, and wrapped tight round with linen, dipped in some chemical solution. The external air was thus excluded from touching any part of the body. Bodies thus preserved will remain undecayed for thousands of years. The drugs and spices used in this process were not produced in Egypt, but were brought from India, either directly or by means of Arabia. The merchants of Arabia dealt in these commodities, and hence the spices were called spices of Arabia, though, in fact, Arabia did not produce the spices, but imported them from India.

The imports, then, of Egypt consisted of timber, metals, drugs, and spices.

Thirdly. The commerce of a country depends upon its geographical position in reference to other nations.

As the business of a shop will often depend upon its position in the town, so the commerce of a country will be affected by its relative position with reference to other countries.

Egypt, you know, is situated in Africa. It has deserts on the west and south. On the north is the Mediterranean Sea; on the east, the Red Sea, and the Isthmus of Suez. Egypt, then, could not trade with any nation on her south or west, but from her northern frontier she could trade with the Phœnicians, who, at that time, were in possession of all the trade of the Mediterranean Sea. From her eastern boundary she could trade to India, while by land she might trade with Palestine and Arabia. From the Phœnicians, in exchange for her corn, she might receive timber, and metals of various kinds, and manufactured goods of almost all descriptions. The Phœnicians were so remarkable for their skill in hewing timber, that Solomon employed them to cut timber in the forest of Lebanon, for the buildings he erected in Jerusalem. From Palestine she might import balm, and olive oil, and honey. From the Arabians, and from India, she might obtain spices and drugs, and other productions of the warmer climates. In the days of Joseph, we find that companies of

Arabian merchants carried commodities of this description into Egypt. Indeed, we may remark, that all the foreign trade of Egypt was carried on, not by Egyptians, but by foreigners.

Fourthly. The commerce of a country depends upon its means of internal and external communication.

A facility of communication is essential to the internal commerce of a country; for how can commodities be conveyed from one part of a country to another without roads, or rivers, or canals, or some other means of communication? A facility of communication is also essential to foreign commerce; for without this, how can its exports be brought from the interior of the country to the sea-coast? or how can its imports, when imported, be distributed throughout the country?

The internal communication of Egypt was very extensive, by means of the canals, which were formed to carry off the waters of the Nile. As the overflowing of this river was the cause of all the fertility of the land, canals were formed with the view of conducting the water in every direction, so that the whole country might be placed under water, and thus be universally manured. These canals served also for communication between different parts of the country, by means of boats. Besides these canals, the formation of good roads was very easy. The country was level, and there were no woods to be cleared away. Hence Egypt had every facility for exchanging the productions of the country for those of the towns, and also for carrying her exports to the coasts. Her harbours, too, though not numerous, were sufficient for the purposes of external commerce. This was proved experimentally in a subsequent period of her history.

With regard to the construction of ships. Egypt must have imported the timber, and the copper, and the iron from the Phœnicians; but having abundance of flax, she had ample materials for the sails and rigging. It has been said, that at one time Egypt had four hundred ships. But we know not how large they were, or how they were employed. Possibly they were employed in the trade between Egypt

and India. It may seem surprising to us that Egypt did not become more of a maritime power. As the country was under water for three months in the year, and was intersected with canals, the people must have been accustomed to boating; and a very small increase of naval skill would have been sufficient to enable them to navigate the sea. The construction of ships was not, by any means, an effort to which they were unequal. The same labour and skill which were employed to construct the pyramids would have been sufficient to build a fleet. But we should recollect that foreign commerce was never encouraged, either by the laws or the religion of Egypt. Their polity was founded upon agriculture, as was afterwards that of the Israelites. It may also be observed, that in the time of the ancient Egyptians the art of navigation was but imperfectly known. They sailed chiefly along the coasts, and though sufficiently acquainted with astronomy to make some use of the stars, they had no knowledge of the mariners' compass.

Fifthly. The commerce of a country depends upon the state of the arts and sciences in that country.

Some of the arts and sciences are essential to the carrying on of commerce. Not only must men have arrived to such a degree of civilization as includes the right of private property, the formation of civil government, and the knowledge of those arts which are essential to existence, but they must also be acquainted with the method of computing accounts, the construction of ships, and the art of navigation. In Scripture we have several references to the wisdom of Egypt. We are told the wisdom of Solomon excelled all the wisdom of Egypt; and Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians. The knowledge of the mechanical arts, shown by the Israelites in the construction of the tabernacle in the wilderness, is a proof that these arts were well known in Egypt. The Israelites were originally shepherds, and must have learned these arts during their sojourn in Egypt.

The Egyptians are said to have invented geometry. For, as the waters of the Nile overflowed, all distinctions between the different farms were destroyed, and it was necessary to

make a new geometrical survey of the land every year, in order to assign to every man his farm. The science of geometry necessarily implies the art of measuring quantities, and of computing values.

With regard to money, the Egyptians, like the Chinese of the present day, had no coin, but used gold and silver bullion. These were paid and received by weight. This was the practice at a very early period of the world. The substitution of coin was not discovered till a few centuries before the Christian era.

In all countries money was originally paid away by weight. Abraham, for the purchase of a burying-place, weighed unto Ephron four hundred shekels of silver—money current with the merchant. This denotes a distinction from the money in ordinary use. It was, probably, silver in pieces, or bars, bearing a stamp denoting its fineness and quantity, placed on it, peradventure, by Phœnician merchants. We find that the practice of weighing money continued from the time of Abraham to the days of Jeremiah. The denunciations in Scripture against false balances and deceitful weights, though applicable to all cases of selling by weight, had probably a primary reference to the weighing of money. And when the prophet Daniel said to Belshazzar, "Thou art weighed in the balance and found wanting," the reference is, probably, to a piece of money, which when weighed was found deficient in the weight marked upon it. It may be observed, too, that in ancient times silver, not gold, was usually employed as money. In the Jewish history we do not read of gold being employed as money till the time of King David, when he purchased the threshing-floor of Araunah, the Jebusite. Gold is often mentioned, but merely as jewels or ornaments. The shekel is not the name of a coin, but of a weight; and it may be useful to you to recollect that a shekel is equal to about half an ounce; so that, reckoning silver at five shillings, and gold at 4*l.* an ounce, a shekel of silver is worth half a crown, and a shekel of gold about 2*l.* "A piece" is supposed to mean a shekel. When we read of thirty pieces of silver we are to understand thirty shekels of silver; that is, thirty half-

crowns. A talent weighed 125 lbs., and was worth 3,000 shekels. A talent of silver was worth 350*l.*—a talent of gold was worth 6,000*l.* The quantity of money in circulation in Egypt was probably not great. For as every man raised his own food, and prepared his own clothing, he had but little occasion to buy anything, and, consequently, would want but little money. The quantity of money in circulation in any country will be in proportion to its internal and external trade. It seems likely, too, from the history of Joseph, that the tax or rent paid to the sovereign was paid in the produce of the land, and not in money. But though the quantity of gold or silver employed as money might not have been considerable, yet it seems reasonable to suppose that the trade of Egypt must have supplied her with the precious metals in abundance. What, in the present day, we call the balance of trade, must have been greatly in her favour. The value of the exports must have exceeded her imports, and the balance would be paid in the precious metals. It appears that in the time of Joseph corn was sold for ready money; and from several circumstances it would appear that ancient Egypt was a wealthy country. When the Israelites quitted Egypt *every* woman borrowed of her neighbour jewels of silver, and jewels of gold, and raiment; and as Aaron soon afterwards made a golden calf, in imitation of the Egyptians, we may infer that in Egypt the idols were made of gold. Nearly a thousand years afterwards the prophet Daniel speaks of the gold, and the silver, and the precious things of Egypt.

As I am not now lecturing upon the antiquities of Egypt, I shall not give you any description of the pyramids, or the other architectural monuments of the Egyptians. I will only observe, that probably the cost of erecting them was not so great as we may be disposed to imagine. As provisions were abundant and cheap, the rate of wages must have been low. And as the king received his taxes in kind, he could not better dispose of it than by giving it to the people in exchange for their labour. One motive for erecting these buildings was, no doubt, to employ the people. In a country so fertile, and where the desires of the people were so few, the number

of unemployed people must have been great. These people might have been employed in manufactures, or in war, or have remained idle. Egypt had but few manufactures, and but little commerce; and having no powerful neighbour, was seldom at war; and hence, to prevent the people being idle, and in consequence, perhaps, mutinous, they were employed in erecting pyramids. If this were the case, the motive was a good one. We have only to regret that they were not employed on something more useful.

The arts and sciences were maintained in Egypt by a cast or class of men, who may be called the sacred, or the literary class. From this class were taken the ministers of religion, the lawyers, the magistrates, the officers of government, the physicians, the astronomers, and all those who did not live by manual labour. No less than one-third of all the taxes was devoted to the support of the literary class. The Jewish legislator adopted this feature of the Egyptian polity. The tribe of Levi were the literary class. The distribution of this tribe throughout the land served to impart instruction to a people, who, being without the art of printing, had but few other means of obtaining knowledge.

Sixthly. The commerce of a country depends upon its laws.

Some laws are friendly to commerce; some are unfriendly to commerce; and commerce is more likely to flourish where the laws are friendly than where they are unfriendly. The principal laws and customs relative to commerce are the following:—

1. All the land belonged to the king, who was paid a rent equal to one-fifth part of the produce. This law was unfriendly to commerce. No land could be bought or sold. If a person acquired wealth by commerce, he could not invest it in land. Under the feudal system which existed throughout Europe, until about three hundred years ago, the land was considered to belong to the king, and the subordinate proprietors held it from the king by a tenure of certain services to be performed. Hence their estates could not be sold. But after Henry VII. permitted the barons and other

landlords to sell their estates, the commerce of England began to flourish.

2. In Egypt all the inhabitants were divided into hereditary castes. This was a great restriction upon trade. The son of a shoemaker must be a shoemaker. All the sons of tailors must be tailors; and the son of a soldier, however unfit for a soldier, must, nevertheless, be a soldier. In the history of the world we nowhere meet with this institution except in Egypt and in India; and hence some have supposed that there must have been formerly a great intercourse between the two countries. This institution of castes may have contributed to excellence in the mechanical trades, but must have operated as a check on commercial enterprise.

3. Not only did every person by birth belong to a class, but he was also required to obtain from a magistrate a certificate that he actually followed a trade; and any one who forged a certificate was punished with death. Such a law shows that the magistrates wished to keep the people employed, and at the same time proves that the people were disposed to be idle. Among the Egyptians, it was customary for the men to mind their domestic affairs at home, and to leave all matters of trade, of buying and selling, to be managed by the women. The circumstance of the management of the family being dependent on the wife, was probably the reason of the law which existed in Egypt, that in case parents were reduced to poverty, not their sons, but their daughters should be compelled to support them.

4. By the law of Egypt, the property of a debtor became liable to pay his debts; but his person was free. It was sometimes customary for people to borrow money upon the security of lodging the embalmed body of their fathers. An Egyptian who did not pay this debt, and redeem the body, was declared infamous. The Egyptians sometimes produced the dead bodies of their ancestors, in their private festivals, with this inscription on the head:—"Look at me and be merry, for such as I am, so thou shalt be when thou art dead."

Imprisonment for debt has rarely, if ever, existed in con-

nection with domestic slavery. An insolvent man is not likely to obtain the means of paying his creditors while confined in a prison. But if slavery exists, he may be sold for a slave, and the produce applied, as far as it may go, in liquidation of his debts. In countries where slavery does not exist, debtors are often imprisoned, either as a means of detention, if they wish to escape with their property, or as a punishment in case their insolvency has been produced by their own misconduct —or with a view of compelling their friends to pay the debt in order to procure their liberation.

5. The Egyptians had a funeral tribunal, by which the dead were tried before they could be buried. After death, every Egyptian was brought before this tribunal, and, if convicted of having in his life acted unworthily, he was denied a place in the burial-place of his ancestors. This was a great disgrace to his family; and, according to the Egyptian theology, it deprived the spirit of the deceased of an entrance into heaven. One of the things which caused the infliction of this mark of disgrace was that of dying in debt. If, however, the children or friends of the deceased should pay his debts, as they sometimes did, he was allowed to be buried. Such an institution as this must have had a powerful effect upon the conduct of the people in their commercial transactions with each other. A man who knew that every act of dishonesty, unfair representation, falsehood, or trickery, which he may practise in the course of business, might be remembered and uttered, to the disgrace of his family, over his dead body, would be cautious not to give occasion to such a procedure.

As we have no exact information with regard to the mode of trial, we may, perhaps, be allowed to picture to our imagination the form of the proceedings. Let us suppose it was somewhat like this:—An Egyptian merchant dies—the day arrives for the investigation of his conduct. The hall of judgment is thronged with citizens;—the body, followed by a long train of mourning relatives, is brought in, and placed in the midst—the judges take their seats, and the whole assembly is hushed into silence. An officer of the court pro-

claims,—"If any of you know any just cause or impediment why the body of our deceased fellow-citizen should not be committed to the grave, you are now to declare it." A voice! "I object to the burial; for I often had dealings with the deceased, and I could never depend upon his word." Another voice! "I object to the burial; for the deceased attempted to injure my character, in order to get away my customers." A third voice! "I object to the burial; for he lived at a most extravagant rate, when he knew he was unable to pay his debts." A fourth voice! "I object to the burial; for he made over his property to a friend, and then took the benefit of the insolvent debtors' act." The judges rise, and exclaim: "Enough! Enough! Take him away!—take him away! You may throw the body to be devoured by the beasts of the field, or the fowls of the air; but never let the earth be polluted by receiving into its bosom the worthless remnant of so vile a man."

Seventhly. The commerce of a country depends upon the genius and character of its inhabitants.

A nation may possess every natural advantage for commerce, and have laws friendly to its encouragement; but if it have no corresponding taste or genius, or adaptation of character, its commerce will never thrive.

The Egyptian character had three defects in a commercial point of view.

1. They were very idle. On one of their pyramids was inscribed: "No native Egyptian worked here." The idleness of the Egyptians was, no doubt, produced in part by the climate. The inhabitants of all warm climates are less disposed to exertion, and have less physical strength than those of cold climates. In the history of war, we find that conquests have always travelled south; that is, the inhabitants of southern nations have always been conquered by the northerns. Another cause of the idleness of the Egyptians was the abundance of the means of subsistence. We generally find that the more fertile the land, the more idle are the people. Arabia was as warm as Egypt, and yet the Arabians, whose lands are barren, are very active and enterprising. The negroes of the

western coast of Africa, who live under a burning sun, but whose means of subsistence are scanty, are a stout and athletic race of men.

2. Another defect in the commercial character of the Egyptians was, that they had no taste for the luxuries and comforts of life. Had a taste for luxuries existed among them, it would have counteracted the effect produced by the climate, and the abundance of food. They would then have been industrious, in order to obtain these luxuries. Dr. Johnson observes, that no man loves labour for its own sake. The labourer always looks for some reward—some real or fancied good, which is to be the end of his labour. And where people have no desire for anything beyond what they possess, there is no motive to stimulate exertion. Nothing is so necessary to commerce, and nothing is so beneficial to the individuals themselves, as a desire of what are called the comforts of life. Where people are contented with the lowest kind of food, with the coarsest clothing, and with a miserable hovel for a habitation, that country is not likely soon to become commercial.

3. Another defect in the commercial character of the Egyptians was, their unsociable disposition. The distinction of castes made them unsociable towards each other; and their ignorance and prejudices made them unsociable towards all other nations. An ancient writer has stated, that in Egypt national antipathies were so strong, that an Egyptian man would not kiss a Phœnician woman. Whether these feelings were ever carried to so great an extent as this may reasonably be questioned; but the statement shows that they must have been very powerful. All their neighbours thought them a sulky and gloomy race of people. Such a disposition is quite opposed to the spirit of commerce. A merchant knows nothing of national prejudices. He does not consider any class of men his natural enemies merely because the place where they were born is separated by a chain of mountains, or a river, or an arm of the sea, from the place where he was born. He is a citizen of the world, and he promotes the happiness of the whole world, by imparting to the inhabitants of every

part of it comforts and luxuries which but for him they could not possess.

The character of the Egyptians, then, was one main cause why commerce was not carried to any great extent among them. They were a grave, slow, idle, unenterprising race of men, vindictive when offended, but otherwise of a quiet, peaceable disposition, very temperate in their habits, very fond of ancient customs, very submissive to their monarchs, very moral, and very religious.

Let us, in conclusion, take for our practical government our last observation—the commerce of a country depends upon the character of the people. Let us never forget, that the main cause of the prosperity of any country or of any city lies in the mental and moral character of its inhabitants. Every possible advantage of situation may be rendered nugatory by the misconduct of the people. If, instead of availing themselves of these natural advantages, and persevering in the steady pursuits of trade, the merchants neglect their business, or have recourse to swindling, or gambling, or smuggling, they will assuredly bring upon themselves that ruin and degradation which such practices never fail to produce. It is by honesty, by industry, by prudence, by perseverance, and by public spirit, that nations and cities are made to prosper. Every man should endeavour to increase the prosperity of the place in which he dwells, and to improve the character of the population. There is no virtue more noble or more illustrious than public spirit—that spirit which induces a man to sacrifice his interest, his ease, and his inclination, to promote the public good. But, mind,—party spirit is not public spirit; party spirit seeks the ascendancy of a party—public spirit seeks the good of the whole. One is a gilded counterfeit—the other is sterling gold. Mind, too, that he who wishes to be a useful man must be an active man. Men who possess only a mediocrity of talents, if they are active men, will often do more good, and acquire greater influence, than other men of far superior attainments, if sunk in indolence. What they are inferior in weight they make up in velocity; and hence they acquire a higher mo-

mentum than is obtained by heavier bodies that move more slowly.

Among the most effective means of improving the character of a people we place literary and scientific institutions. They diffuse a taste for philosophical inquiries; they tend to the formation of habits of mental discipline; they quicken the desire for knowledge, and hence lead to reading and discussion; they bring together persons of various classes in the community, and thus soften the asperities of religious and political feelings; they exclude from the mind those trains of thought that would seduce it into error or frivolity, and thus they give the reason dominion over the passions. To the young they are especially useful, as they promote that general cultivation of the intellectual powers, which in after life is always found to be the surest means of success in their professional pursuits.

When we see what a number of sciences there are, and recollect how much time is required to master any one of them, we have strong motives to redouble our exertions in the pursuit of knowledge, and great reason for humility, even when our efforts have been most successful. The wisest man on earth knows but little in comparison with what he does not know. But, although we cannot, by the greatest labour, master all the sciences, we may, by a small degree of labour, acquire such a general knowledge of them, as shall contribute to our own pleasure, afford us agreeable topics of conversation, heighten our respectability in the world, and enable us to be useful to others. It has been said, indeed, that "a little knowledge is a bad thing," which is correct, in the same sense in which it may be said that a little money is a bad thing. It is a bad thing to have but little; but, although it is a bad thing to have but little, either of money or of knowledge, yet it is worse to have none.

Let us then hope, that our Literary and Scientific Institution will produce some of the effects we have described. We profess not to be philosophers; we meet together for our own edification and improvement. By teaching others we instruct ourselves. By imparting our treasures we increase

our store. While we are promoting the welfare of others, we are securing for ourselves a harvest of rich reflections in the time to come. And, be assured, that among all the pleasures of the present life, there is none more pure—none more permanent—none more gratifying, to a well-regulated mind, than that which arises from the consciousness of having promoted the happiness of those around us.

LECTURE II.

THE COMMERCE OF ANCIENT GREECE.

Origin of Civilization. Early History of Greece. Security of Private Property—Attica—Sparta. Administration of Justice—Laws referring to Trade—Courts of Law. Establishment of Cities—Advantages of Cities—Proper Situations for Commercial Cities—Athens—Corinth—Syracuse. Markets and Fairs—Festivals—Ancient Legislation with regard to Fairs. Monetary and Banking Institutions—Coin and Banks of Athens. Commercial Character of the Greeks.

THE early history of Greece, like that of all other countries, is involved in fable and obscurity. The aborigines were found in a state of savage life, and the civilization which had spread in Egypt and Babylon was to them totally unknown. We should not, however, infer from this and other similar cases, that the savage state is the natural state of man. If men had been created savages, they would have remained savages for ever. It is the property of ignorance to be contented with itself. It is impossible for men to desire those acquisitions of the existence of which they have no knowledge. The history of the world does not present us with a single instance of a nation of savages having become civilized by their own spontaneous exertions. Wherever barbarous nations have become civilized, civilization has been imported, and has been acquired by an intercourse with civilized nations. There is abundant evidence that previous to the Deluge mankind were in a state of civilization. The individuals who were preserved from that Deluge were in a state of civilization. The first exertion of Noah was, to plant a vineyard, a circumstance which shows an acquaintance with an advanced state of

civilized life. The arts and sciences with which he was acquainted, he would, of course, communicate to his descendants, and thus civilization would be perpetuated.

Those families who settled in the plains of Babylon and in Egypt never appear to have lost their acquaintance with the arts of civilized life. Several reasons may be assigned for this. In the first place, their lands were so fertile that it did not require the labour of the whole community to raise food, and hence those whose labour was not applied to the cultivation of the earth, devoted themselves to the practice of the mechanical arts, and to the study of the sciences. Secondly, as food was so abundant the population of these countries increased very rapidly; hence there was a greater subdivision of labour, and a consequently greater production of the comforts and conveniences of life. Thirdly. These countries were extensive plains, and, consequently, as the inhabitants multiplied they did not take their journey to distant lands in search of new settlements, but cultivated the neighbouring districts. Hence, the intercourse of the different tribes, or families, was maintained. Any new discovery in the social arts was quickly known to the whole community, and thus civilization was advanced.

On the other hand, those families of men who had travelled to countries intersected by mountains, soon lost their intercourse with each other. When a nation became too populous, a part of them, under the guidance of some chosen leader, crossed the mountains, or the rivers, in search of a new habitation. Their intercourse with the country they had left was for ever renounced; and as their numbers were few, and the exertions of the whole tribe necessary for the raising of food, they had no leisure to cultivate the arts of luxury; nor even any of those mechanical arts which were not essential to existence. Hence, in the course of a few generations, many of those arts became forgotten, and those tribes who again branched from them became increasingly ignorant, and ultimately fell into a state of savage barbarity. Such, we think, was the process by which some families of mankind, originally civilized, fell into barbarism.

In this barbarous state was Ancient Greece. After the lapse of some centuries, various colonies of Egyptians and Phœnicians, who were civilized nations, settled on the coasts, and introduced the arts of civilization among the inhabitants of the country. They established the rights of property, the form of civil government, and taught the people many useful arts with which they were previously unacquainted. The original inhabitants of the country having abundance of fertile land which they knew not how to cultivate, and finding the advantage they received from the superior knowledge of the colonists, invited such settlers, and submitted to their government. These colonists were not, however, settlers sent out by the countries to which they belonged, but were independent tribes, who, from various causes, had gone in search of new habitations, under the guidance of some favourite leader. Attica, the capital of which was Athens, is said to have been colonized by Cecrops, an Egyptian, in the year 1556, before the Christian era.

Greece was thus necessarily divided into a great many small states. Though the boundaries between these states were sufficient for defence against aggression, they did not prevent a free intercourse between the respective inhabitants. There was a commercial traffic carried on between them. The corn, or the wine, or the wool, or the olives of some states, were exchanged against the metals or the manufactures of the others. At first, nearly the whole commerce of Greece was confined to that carried on between the respective states. Their foreign commerce was very limited. The only civilized nations then known to them were the Persians, the Egyptians, and the Phœnicians. The whole of Europe, with the exception of Greece herself, was in the same state as Tartary, or the uncultivated parts of America at the present day. Neither the Persians nor the Egyptians were commercial nations. But the Greeks traded with the Phœnicians, and obtained, through them, the productions of India, of Africa, and of other parts of the world.

Afterwards the Greeks planted colonies on some of the islands of the Mediterranean Sea, and on the coasts of Asia

Minor; and considerable traffic was carried on between these colonies and the parent states. This commercial intercourse, carried on between the continent of Greece and the colonies, would serve to keep up a maritime force, and promote the art of ship-building and navigation. At a later period, when the whole naval force of Greece was placed under the command of Athens, her power and commerce considerably increased. By means of her shipping, she not only traded directly with all the colonies, but even conducted the carrying trade between the colonies themselves. In time, many of the colonies became distinguished for their commercial prosperity, and most of them possessed an independent government. As a whole, Greece, from the variety of her productions—the ingenuity and activity of her people—the number of her islands—the great extent of sea-coast, and the excellence of her harbours,—had many commercial advantages, which contributed vastly to her wealth. Athens, from the superiority of her fleet, extended her commerce more widely, and in her markets might be found the produce of all the other parts of Greece.

The facts connected with the history of Greece suggest a few commercial propositions, which I will now endeavour to illustrate.

I. Commerce is promoted by the security of private property.

No man loves labour for its own sake. If any man be industrious, it is in hopes of obtaining a future good,—and if the rewards of successful industry may be suddenly snatched away, no man will labour to acquire them. Hence a state of savage life can never be a commercial state. Before commerce can exist, a nation must be sufficiently strong to protect itself against the attacks of other nations; and a government must be established to protect the property of one citizen from the rapacity of another. In the original state of Greece, no commerce could exist; but, as the rights of property became respected, and industry became sure of reaping the fruits of its exertion, then commerce became gradually extended.

But, for the purposes of commerce, not only should there be a security of property, but there must also be a right of *private* property. This observation arises from a view of the Social Institutions of Sparta. The laws of Lycurgus abolished private property. The citizens fared all alike—they feasted together at public tables, and wore the same attire. The highest man in the state could not be distinguished by his dress from the meanest. Luxury was abolished—the coarsest food was provided—gold and silver were prohibited, and money made of iron only was allowed. The citizens were all soldiers, who lived together in a common camp, bound together by a romantic attachment towards their country, but exhibiting no humanity towards their slaves, nor any social feelings of regard for each other. Here was a nation of soldiers, without even that taste for luxuries in which soldiers usually indulge. No individual could acquire wealth, for what he possessed belonged to the nation, and the nation had no motive to accumulate wealth, because their laws prohibited those comforts which wealth procures. Here was savage life reduced to a system—a system which required the sacrifice of all the social feelings of our nature. A Spartan mother asked a soldier, returning from the army, "Is our army victorious?" The soldier replied, "Your son is killed." "Fool!" replied she, "I did not ask about him; I asked if our army was victorious." No institutions could possibly be more anti-commercial.

II. Commerce is promoted by an impartial administration of public justice.

The right of private property can be secured only by law; and the laws affecting property are more numerous in commercial than in other countries; because the modes of acquiring and conveying property are more numerous, and the rights of different claimants cannot be so easily defined. Commerce is affected by all laws relating to the production of commercial commodities—the mode of transferring property—the facility of transport—the laying on of taxes, or the punishment of crimes. Besides these general laws, which affect all branches of commerce, there are in many countries

laws affecting particular trades, or the export and import of particular commodities.

The Athenians had laws which restricted exports. They prohibited the export of all things which their land did not produce in greater abundance than was required for home consumption. Thus figs, and all other kinds of fruit, except olives, were prohibited, as were also wool and pitch. The land of Attica was barren—neither tillage nor pasturage prospered, but it produced abundance of olives. The olive was considered sacred to Minerva. According to the legend, when the city of Athens was first built, Neptune and Minerva contended which should give a name to the city, and they agreed that which of them should make the most useful present to man should be entitled to name the new city. Neptune struck the ground and produced a horse. Minerva produced the olive. All the gods decided in favour of Minerva, alleging that the olive, which is the emblem of peace, is more useful than the horse, which is the emblem of war. And here it may be observed, that among the ancients, horses were used only in war: the operations of agriculture were performed by oxen; and for riding, mules were employed. Athens was then an exporter of olives, and an importer of corn. Besides olives, Athens had for export honey, and marble, and the produce of her copper and silver mines; and in later times, a variety of elegant works of art. We may observe here, that olives were not only eaten as an article of food, but the olive oil was used in a variety of ways, —in anointing the person—in burning in lamps—in the making of bread, and other ways where we are accustomed to use butter. Honey was of very extensive use, as the ancients had no sugar. The description given of Canaan—a land flowing with milk and honey—must have been very attractive to a people unacquainted with either tea or sugar.

The laws of Athens also regulated imports. It was an object to encourage the importation of corn, of timber and other materials for ship-building. If any Athenian factor or merchant conveyed corn to any other place than to Athens, an action was to be brought against him, and the informer

might claim half the corn; and to prevent forestalling, no inhabitant of Athens was allowed more than a certain quantity, fixed by law.

There were also laws at Athens for the regulation of particular trades. Fishmongers were not allowed to put their fish in water, to render them more saleable. A fishmonger, who overrated his fish, and afterwards took less than he had first asked for them, was to suffer imprisonment. No seller of seals was to retain the impression of one he had sold.

There were also general laws referring to trade. No man was to exercise two trades. No foreigner was allowed to sell wares in the market, or to exercise any trade. He who obtained great repute, and was esteemed the most ingenious in his profession, was to receive a mark of honour. Any one might bring an action of slander against him who reviled or ridiculed another on account of his trade. At Athens, theft was punished by fine, imprisonment, or death, according to the nature of the offence; but at Sparta, theft was never punished, unless the thief was caught in the act. Whoever lived an idle life, squandered his father's property, or refused to support his parents when in want, was declared infamous. But if the father had neglected to bring up his son to some trade, the son was not bound to maintain his father, although in want. It was incumbent on the members of the Areopagus to inquire by what means every person subsisted—a regulation supposed to have been borrowed from the ancient Egyptians.

There were several courts of law in Athens. In most of them the judges were taken from the citizens at large, by lot, and the number of judges varied from 50 to 2,000. When the judges were so numerous, it followed necessarily that some of them were not qualified to fill the office. Every citizen was eligible to be a judge, and was paid a certain sum for every cause he tried. From the judges being so numerous, and changing, possibly, at every trial, there was often a want of uniformity in their decisions, and the strict letter of the law was not always observed. Hence Aristotle, in his "Rhetoric," thus addresses young pleaders:—"If," says he, "the

law is in your favour, you must contend for the sanctity of law. You may state that the only difference between a savage and a civilized state is, that one has laws and the other has none. But we may as well be without laws, if they are not to be observed. "But if," adds he, "the law is against you, then say that law is mere convention—that what is law in one state is not law in another—and what is law to day may not be law to morrow; and hence we should always be guided by principles of equity, which being natural and universal, must be superior to law."

At Athens, the parties might plead their own cause, or employ advocates. In case advocates were employed, they were allowed a certain time to speak, according to the importance of the case. An equal quantity of water was given to each advocate. When one commenced speaking, the water was set running through a vessel like an hour-glass; and when the water stopped running, the advocate must stop speaking.

The highest court in Athens was the Areopagus. The archons, or chief magistrates, became judges in this court after their year of office had expired. The meetings of the court were held in the open air, partly because it was considered unlawful that the criminal and accuser should be under the same roof, and partly that the judges, whose persons were esteemed sacred, should contract no pollution from conversing with profane and wicked men. They also heard and determined all causes at night, and in darkness, that they might not be influenced in favour of the criminal or the accuser, and that no one might know the number, or discern the countenances of the judges. This court took cognizance of almost all crimes, vices, and abuses. All matters connected with religion were referred to the judgment of this court. You will recollect that the Apostle Paul was brought before it upon a charge of being a setter forth of strange gods. The reputation of this court was at one time so high, that even foreign states, when any differences happened among them, voluntarily submitted to its decisions.

III. Commerce is promoted by the formation of towns and cities.

We may form a tolerably correct estimate of the degree of civilization and knowledge that may exist in a country, by the proportion of the population that live in towns and cities. Men who are scattered over a wide surface have not the same means of improving their knowledge as when they are assembled in a smaller compass. In cities there is a greater division of labour, and hence each branch of industry is improved. In cities, too, there are many persons carrying on the same branch of trade, and hence there is a perpetual rivalry, which tends to improvement. In cities, too, there are associations for various purposes, and means of acquiring literary and other information, which has the effect of enlightening the population, and consequently of improving the arts.

Commerce tends to the formation of cities. The place of imports and exports soon becomes densely populated. The seat of manufactures must always be a place where a number of workmen can be assembled together. The high wages which are given for labour induces labourers to leave the country districts, and resort to commercial cities. As the arts and sciences are found in greater perfection in cities, people who wish to pursue them resort thither. Young men commencing life go to cities, because all kinds of labour are better rewarded, and because the demand for it is more regular and constant. Hence, as the commerce of any place increases, its population increases also — the demand for labour is greater, and it furnishes more of the comforts and luxuries of life.

Commercial cities are usually found on the coasts of the sea, or on the banks of rivers. In cases where the source of the river is in the same country, a city is usually built at the place where the river ceases to be navigable for large ships. Such is the case with London, and also with Waterford. Were the city built lower down the stream, part of the advantages of the river would be lost; and were it built higher up, larger ships could not approach it, and their cargoes would have to be discharged into barges, and thus conveyed to the city.

The cities of Greece were not formed for purposes of commerce. Many of them were built at a distance from the sea, in order to avoid surprise from pirates, who, in the early periods of Greece, were in the habit of visiting their coasts. The chief commercial cities were Athens, and Corinth, and Syracuse, and the capitals of the islands of Crete and Rhodes.

Athens, the capital of the State of Attica, was about two miles from the sea, but had fortified walls passing from the city to the coast, so that it had always a free access to the harbours. The soil of Attica was barren; but Athens acquired commerce by her fleet and her manufactures, and her power over some of the other states of Greece. Athens, in its most flourishing state, was one of the largest and most beautiful cities in Greece, and was above twenty-two miles in circumference. The citadel was built upon a high rock in the middle of a plain; but as the inhabitants increased, buildings were extended over the whole plain, and these, in distinction from the citadel, were called the lower city. Every city in Greece had its temple, its theatre, its gymnasium, or place for public exercise, and its forum or market-place. In Athens all these were numerous. A gymnasium was a large edifice, consisting of various parts, and capable of holding several thousand people. It contained places for the youth to perform their exercises, and apartments for the philosophers to deliver their lectures. It also contained baths for the refreshment of the citizens, and the whole was surrounded by a garden and a sacred grove. Athens, too, had halls in which companies of tradesmen met, and deliberated on matters relating to their trade. To show that trade was not considered an ignoble employment, it is stated that Solon engaged in merchandize, and Plato sold oil in Egypt.

Corinth owed its commerce to its situation. It stood on the Isthmus of Corinth; and when navigation was so imperfect, mariners preferred landing their goods on one side of the isthmus, and passing them by land to the other, rather than sail round the peninsula. Corinth became remarkable for her manufactures, especially those formed of metals, and her

earthenware. Corinth also became celebrated for her wealth, and her attainments in the arts. She owed her greatness entirely to commerce. Athens was the capital of the chief state in the Greek confederacy. She was the place of fashionable resort. She was the school of science. She was the place where men of wealth chose to reside; and besides, she received the revenues of several tributary states. But Corinth had none of these advantages. It was to commerce, and to commerce alone, that she stood indebted for her greatness. And yet, in the splendour of her edifices —in the wealth and luxury of her citizens, she was one of the most considerable cities in Greece. The beautiful order of architecture which bears her name was here invented, and may be considered as a standing illustration of the influence of commerce in promoting the cultivation of the fine arts. It is true that here, as at Athens, the fine arts were associated with laxity of manners. But if we are called upon to abandon the fine arts because they have ministered to voluptuousness, may we not, with equal propriety, be asked to renounce the abstract and physical sciences because they have been employed in the service of infidelity? To the Christian church at Corinth the Apostle Paul addressed two epistles, in which are allusions to the exercises practised at the Isthmian games, which were celebrated every third year, in the immediate neighbourhood of the city.

Syracuse was the capital of the island of Sicily. It was originally founded by a colony from Corinth. The colonists, after the example of the parent state, applied themselves to commerce, and so successfully, that Syracuse was considered to rival even Carthage in wealth. In its best estate it was twenty-two miles in circuit, and was remarkable for its convenient port, its elegant buildings, and splendid public edifices. It long maintained its power as an independent state, and withstood attacks from both the Athenians and the Carthaginians, but was ultimately taken by the Romans. The siege, however, was protracted for three years, by the mechanical contrivances of Archimedes.

Crete, the largest of the Greek islands, is said to have

contained a hundred cities. At one time it possessed considerable maritime power, but its power and its character afterwards declined. Both sacred and profane writers state that the "Cretans were always liars;" and in later times their conduct added but little to the fame of Greece.

Rhodes was remarkable for the purity of its climate and the excellence of its wines. It was also famous for its Colossus of brass, that bestrode the harbour, so that the largest ships could sail between its legs; it was 70 cubits or 105 feet high, and was supposed to contain 720,000 lbs. of brass. It stood for 85 years, and was then thrown down by an earthquake.

IV. Commerce is promoted by the establishment of markets and fairs.

A fair is a large market, and a market is a small fair. The word fair is derived from the French word *foire*, which is derived from the Latin word *forum*, which signifies a market. The word market is derived from the Latin word *mercatus*, and is of the same derivation as mercantile. Markets are held more frequently than fairs, and are established chiefly for the sale of the produce of their neighbourhood. At Athens, the forums, or market-places, were numerous. The old, or principal one, was a large square, where the people used to assemble, and where commodities were exposed to sale. Collectors attended in the forum, to receive the duties laid on everything that was sold, and magistrates to superintend what passed. There each trade had a separate market, as the baker's market, the fish market, the oil market, and many others; and different hours were appointed for the sale of different commodities. As this was the most frequented part of the city, workmen of all kinds endeavoured to reside near it, and in it houses let at a higher price than anywhere else. The Scythians kept in pay by the republic to maintain order, were encamped in the middle of the forum.

In the early ages of the world, nearly all the traffic between nations, and even between districts of the same country, was carried on by periodical fairs. The foundation of a city was always commemorated by the institution of a festival.

As the city was usually dedicated to some deity, this festival was considered a religious festival. Whenever a large concourse of people assemble, a degree of traffic is necessarily produced. The merchants attended to supply the multitudes with such articles as they required; hence, these periodical seasons of festivity became seasons of traffic. In those times, all merchants were retailers. A merchant went to a distant fair, and purchased goods. He brought those goods to another fair, where there was a demand for them, and sold them to those who had occasion to consume them. The import merchant and the retailer were the same person. It is not until nations have become highly civilized and wealthy, that the retail business is carried on as a distinct branch of trade. To buy at once a large stock of goods, and to sell them in small quantities, as they may be required, is a branch of business that can be carried on only in a settled and populous country. A few centuries ago, even in England, if a man wanted to buy a piece of cloth or of silk, he must have waited till the next fair-day; at present, shopkeepers can supply the public immediately with most of the commodities that were formerly obtained at fairs. Annual fairs are still, however, kept up in some places, chiefly for the sale of live stock and agricultural produce.

It was an object of all ancient legislators, to establish markets and fairs. Moses required that all the males in the country should appear three times in the year at Jerusalem. Though the chief object of this regulation was, no doubt, to keep up in the minds of the people a sense of religion, yet a secondary object was to facilitate the internal trade and commerce of the country. These religious festivals were public fairs, and we find, from the history of the New Testament, that traffic was sometimes carried on even in the temple itself. On this subject, we quote the language of Michaelis, in his 'Commentaries on the Laws of Moses.'

"When we speak of Commerce, we must distinguish between the internal commerce of the people with one another, and that which is carried on with other nations, especially by sea. For the former, with which no state can

dispense without great disadvantage, provision was made by the three festivals, to the celebration of which all the Israelites were assembled thrice every year. Conventions of this nature, instituted for religious purposes, have generally, withal, been made instrumental to the purposes of commerce. Our *Messen* (fairs) have their names from (*Missæ*), masses which were sung at particular seasons, and to which, in Catholic times, people from all countries resorted. As here there were buyers, of course there came, also, merchants with their commodities, and thus arose yearly fairs. The holy pilgrimages to Mecca gave, in like manner, an impulse to the trade of Arabia. Hence, we see, that although in the Mosaic institutions, the interests of internal commerce *were* indirectly consulted, it was only in such a manner that the carrying it on could not become a distinct employment, but could merely occupy the weeks of leisure from the toils of agriculture,—before harvest, at the feast of the Passover,—after harvest, at the feast of Pentecost,—and on the conclusion of the vintage, at the feast of Tabernacles."

In the same way public festivals were established in all the cities of Greece. Each city had its festivals, as parishes in some parts of England have their feasts and their wakes. Each state had its festivals in honour of its founder, or to commemorate important events. And besides these local festivals, there were other festivals of still more dignity common to all Greece. These were the Olympic games, celebrated, every fourth year at Olympia. The Pythian games, celebrated every fifth year at Delphi, in honour of Apollo; the Nemean games, celebrated every third year at Nemea—and the Isthmian games, celebrated every third year near Corinth.

These games produced good effects. *First.*—They gratified the social feelings. The games consisted of contests between runners, wrestlers, boxers, horse racing and chariot racing, and in some places of regattas. Frequently, too, those philosophers who had written books, read them at the games, for the art of printing being then unknown, this was the most effectual way of circulating knowledge among the

people. *Secondly.*—These festivals being all sacred to the gods, and accompanied by sacrifices, served to keep up in the minds of the people sentiments of religion. This probably was the chief reason why all the legislators of antiquity established seasons of festivity; for they all seemed to be aware that sentiments of religion were essential to the existence of civil society. *Thirdly.*—They secured the purposes of commerce. Here merchants and manufacturers brought their goods, and persons who wished to purchase came to buy.

Every motive induced the Greeks to attend these public festivals. The man of piety went to pay his homage to the immortal gods; the man of literature and science went to converse with the philosophers, and to listen to their lectures; the man of pleasure went to see the horse racing, and the chariot racing, and the wrestling, and the theatrical exhibitions; and the man of business went to buy and to sell, and to get gain. Here in her most splendid temples, Religion received the costly offerings of the crowds who thronged to do her homage. While, in the groves of Science, beneath a sky as pure and serene as ever soothed the passions, or as nurtured thought, the philosopher poured into the ears of his auditors, who were seated around him, those instructions which his own travels, or his own reflection, had supplied. While on the neighbouring plain, Pleasure, in a variety of forms, gladdened the hearts and softened the manners of all her votaries.

During the middle ages, to establish a fair was the prerogative of our kings; and all persons holding a fair without a charter, were liable to a penalty. The privilege was usually granted to a corporate town, or to a favourite nobleman, or to a religious establishment. Persons frequenting the fairs were exempt from arrest for debt during the fair, and during the time of going and returning. The parties to whom the privilege was granted, were usually allowed to impose tolls or customs upon the goods which were sold. These fairs, too, were often regarded as sacred to some particular saint.

Whenever a market is established, there are regulations

appointed by the magistrates with reference to the weights and measures. Most of our measures of length appear to have been derived from parts of the human body. Thus, carpenter's work is measured by the *foot.* We speak of a horse being so many *hands* high. In measuring cloth, we have a *nail,* the sixteenth part of a yard; the ell, which means the *arm;* the yard is half a fathom. When a person stretches out both his hands, the distance from the finger of one hand to the middle finger of the other is styled a fathom, and half that distance is a yard; a *cubit* is the distance from the elbow to the finger, the word cubit means elbow. The present yard, consisting of thirty-six inches, was fixed by Henry I., who fixed it at that measure, as that was the length of his own arm. A *pace* is another measure, signifying as far as we can step. With regard to the ancient measures, we are not aware of any connection between the measures of length, the measures of weight, and the measures of capacity. This connection has been fixed in our own country by the Act of Parliament establishing the imperial measure. A cubic foot of distilled water contains a thousand ounces avoirdupois, and sixteen of these ounces make a pound. If, therefore, all our pound weights were to be lost, or the standard become unknown, we could easily ascertain the right weight by filling a cubic vessel with water, and taking 16-1000ths for the pound.

By the same Act, the gallon measure is to contain ten pounds of distilled or rain water. So that, if the gallon should be lost, we could ascertain the standard gallon by weighing out ten pounds weight of water, and the vessel which would hold exactly that quantity would be a gallon. Thus, all our weights and measures depend upon the linear measures; the foot measures the pound, the pound measures the gallon.

It is of importance that there should be only one weight and one measure throughout the country, and also that articles sold by weight in one part of the kingdom should not be sold by measure in another part. Corn is sold by weight in Ireland, and by measure in England. A barrel of

wheat, in Ireland, does not mean as much wheat as will fill a barrel, it means a weight of twenty stone, of fourteen pounds to the stone; a barrel of barley is sixteen stone, and a barrel of oats fourteen stone.

V. Commerce is promoted by institutions which facilitate the circulation of money.

There are two institutions which tend to the circulation of money—a mint and a bank.

In my former lecture I mentioned, that the Egyptians used as money gold and silver bullion. The Greeks, however, were, at a very early period, acquainted with the art of coining. In every nation, the coining of money has been considered a prerogative of the government, and each nation has adopted some peculiar device to place upon the coin. Kings have usually placed their heads on one side of the coin, and the national emblem on the other. The coin of most nations is of a circular form, though there are some exceptions.

Were we to form what we should call "a Pence Table" for Grecian money, we should say,

6 oboles make one drachma.
100 drachmas make one mina.
60 minas make one talent.

An obolus was a silver coin, worth about three-halfpence of our money. There was also a silver coin, called a semi-obolus or half obolus, worth three farthings. And there were also silver pieces of two oboles, three oboles, four oboles, and five oboles. Then came the drachm, a silver coin, worth six oboles, or about ninepence of our money; and there were also two-drachm pieces, and four-drachm pieces—all these were of silver. Although the Athenians had mines of copper, they seem to have had a great aversion to a copper coinage. And hence, to express low values, they made their silver coins so small that they are said to have resembled the scales of fishes. Ultimately they were persuaded to the use of copper coins, though the orator who advocated the measure was afterwards nicknamed "the man of brass." The

smallest copper coin was the eighth of an obolus—equal to three-fourths of a farthing.

Gold was not abundant in Greece, and gold coins were not numerous. The chief, if not the only one, was the didrachm, or two-drachm piece, called a stater, equal in value to twenty silver drachms, and worth above fifteen shillings of our money.

The Athenian coins had a figure of Minerva on one side, and the figure of an owl, the bird sacred to Minerva, on the other. But the coins of different states, and of different ages, differ very much from each other; and hence some of our learned men have been abundantly puzzled upon matters connected with the coins of Greece.

We may observe, that in a point or two the coinage of Greece resembled that of England. At one time all our coins were of silver, gold was not coined till the year 1344, nor copper till the year 1609; and to denote small values, the silver penny was cut into halves and quarters, called halfpennies and fourthings or farthings. When copper was coined, this practice was prohibited; and the small leaden tokens previously issued by private individuals were suppressed.*

The Greeks had no coin for the mina (3*l.* 15*s.*), nor for the talent (225*l.*). These were "moneys of account," in the same way as we reckoned all our money by "pounds sterling," although for centuries we had no coin exactly equal to a pound.

Banking institutions cannot flourish in any society in which property is insecure, whether that insecurity arises from the tyranny of the government, the turbulence of the people, or the incursions of foreign enemies. In oriental countries, where the possession of wealth invites the rapacity of the government, people conceal their wealth by burying it in the earth, and hence we read in Scripture of "treasures hid in a field." A similar practice prevailed in Europe during the times of the feudal system; and treasure-trove was a source of royal revenue, as all the concealed treasure, when found, belonged to the king. In the early ages of

* See Gilbart's History and Principles of Banking.

Greece property was very insecure; partly from the turbulence of the people, partly from the incursions of the neighbouring states. In this state of society the temples were employed as banks. People who had got money lodged it with the priests, and the sanctity of the place preserved it from violation. Even hostile tribes would not take this treasure, lest they should incur the vengeance of the deity to whom the temple was consecrated.

But though the temples served one purpose of banks, that of being a safe place for the deposit of treasure, they did not supersede banks formed for other purposes; and when society became more advanced, the trade of banking was carried on by individuals. The operations of oriental banking are thus referred to in the parable of the Slothful Servant, who had hid his talent in the earth—a very common practice in the East—instead of placing it with a banker:—"Thou oughtest to have put my money to the exchangers, and then at my coming I should have received my own with usury." These bankers were money-changers, money-borrowers, and money-lenders. They exchanged small coins for large ones, and the money of their own country for that of strangers. They also borrowed money. They received and paid out money at their tables in the same way as bankers now keep current accounts with their customers. They also received large sums—"talents"—on which they allowed interest—"usury." The rate at Athens was usually 12 per cent. per annum, or rather 1 per cent. for every new moon. People who were about to go a journey left their money with their bankers upon interest, to receive it "on their return." In most of these bargains there were no witnesses, and sometimes a banker would deny having received the money; but if he did this more than once, he lost the confidence of the public. These bankers were, of course, money-lenders, otherwise they would have had no use for the money they had borrowed. The business of a banker consists in borrowing of one party and lending to another; and the difference in the rate of interest which he gives and receives forms the source of his profit. The bankers of Greece did not lend their money by

discounting bills of exchange, as bills did not then exist; but they lent it chiefly on personal security to persons who were engaged in trade, or who wanted it for other purposes. They often lent to merchants who were fitting out a cargo for a foreign port. In this case, the banker would sometimes send a person in the ship to receive payment of the loan as soon as the cargo was sold. At other times the banker would wait for payment until the return of the ship. As the banker thus shared in the risks of the voyage, the rate of interest paid to him was sometimes so high as 30 per cent. But though a banker might lend to a merchant for the purpose of fitting out a cargo, neither he nor any other citizen could send his money abroad, except in exchange for corn, or for some other commodity allowable by law. He who suffered his money to be exported for other purposes was to be prosecuted—to have no writs or warrants issued against the persons to whom he had lent the money—and the archons were not to permit him to institute any trial in the judicial courts.

There were no usury laws at Athens. Every banker could charge or allow what rate of interest he pleased; but if he agreed to one rate, he could not afterwards charge a higher rate. Among individuals usury was practised to a great extent. The failure of a banker always caused a great sensation, and sometimes he was obliged to hide himself in order to escape the popular indignation. A similar feeling appears in after-times to be excited on such occasions in the Italian states. You are aware that the word *bank-rupt* arises from the practice of *breaking* the *benches* or seats in the market-place of those Italian bankers who were unable to discharge their obligations.

Thus we find that the commercial principles suggested to us by the history of Greece are, that commerce is promoted—by the security of private property—by the impartial administration of public justice—by the formation of towns and cities—by the establishment of markets and fairs—and by institutions that facilitate the circulation of money.

We shall now consider the commercial character of the Greeks.

1. The Greeks were superstitious. "Ye men of Athens," said St. Paul to the Athenians, "I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious;" and at that time the city was "wholly given to idolatry." A merchant should not be "superstitious." He should not be a devotee, nor allow the ceremonial observances of religion to interfere with the duties of the counting-house. But he ought at all times to remember that there is a Superior Power, who "giveth to all life and breath, and all things, and who hath made of one blood all nations who dwell on the face of the earth"—who "giveth us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with joy and gladness"—who "commands the winds and the seas, and they obey him"—and who "giveth the power to get wealth." When a merchant of Greece was about to take a voyage, he went to the temple of Minerva, or of Neptune, or of Mercury, or of some god that was presumed to preside over his particular calling, and implored a benediction on the enterprise he was about to undertake, and on his return he placed a portion of his gains, as a thank-offering, on the altar of the deity whose assistance he had invoked. Athens, who owed her greatness mainly to her fleet, and Corinth, who gained her wealth by her manufactures, were remarkable for the number of their temples. A portion of the wealth obtained by commerce was thus consecrated to the service of religion. Ye Christian merchants, and manufacturers, and shipowners, go to Athens, to Corinth, to the other maritime cities of Greece, and amid the ruins of temples, reared in part by the commerce of a former age, see if ye cannot gather lessons for your own instruction. If their religion was superstitious, and existed apart from morality, will not your condemnation be the greater, if, with a more enlightened faith, and a purer code of morals, you exhibit less devotion?

2. The Greeks are accused of having been regardless of their oaths. The inhabitants of every state in Greece have been subject to this accusation. When a Greek appeared as a witness in a Roman court of justice, his evidence was received with suspicion. If they were regardless of their oaths

it may be inferred that they were still more regardless of their word. We cannot imagine a greater defect in the commercial character. If a merchant wishes to maintain his respectability, he must punctually perform all his agreements and all his promises. Tell me not that the matter in which you have failed is of no importance: be assured that it is of importance. However trifling the matter may be in itself, your having promised to perform it has made it of importance. It is of importance to your own character that you keep your word. If you are regardless of your word in matters of little importance, you will soon become equally regardless in matters of greater moment. "He that is unfaithful in little is unfaithful also in much."

3. The Greeks were very litigious. Men of a strong imagination, and of a great subtlety of genius, are prone to become litigious; their imagination misleads their judgment, and their subtlety finds arguments to support their erroneous opinions. There is no profession more respectable —none more essential to the existence of civil society, than that of the law; but fondness for litigation shows a corrupt taste and a depraved heart. It is best for a merchant to have no dealings with such people; for, however cautious he may be, some point may be raised which will involve him in a lawsuit, and should he even gain the cause, the success will not compensate for the anxiety and the delay it will occasion.

4. The Greeks were deficient in habits of business. We are told in the Acts of the Apostles that, "All the Athenians and strangers which were there, spent their time in nothing else but either to tell or to hear some new thing." A newsmonger is seldom a good man of business. Habits of business is a phrase which includes a variety of qualities—industry, arrangement, calculation, prudence, punctuality, and perseverance; and these virtues are exercised, not from the impulse of particular motives, but from habit. If you hear a man boast of being industrious, you may safely infer that he does not possess the habit of industry; for what a man does from habit, he does mechanically, without thinking of the merits

of his actions, though they may be highly meritorious. The Greeks were inquisitive and active, capable of immense exertion when under the stimulus of powerful motives, but when the stimulus was removed, they sunk into frivolity. They were eccentric, capricious, fickle, and possessed none of that steady uniformity of character necessary to men of business. Those who are fond of drawing parallels between ancient and modern nations, have fancied that there is a resemblance between the ancient Egyptians and the modern Spaniards—the ancient Greeks and the modern French—the ancient Romans and the modern English. Perhaps, in some points, these parallels may hold good, but in others they are defective. However that may be, it is certain that habits of business are essential to a merchant. But though essential to a merchant, they are not peculiar to him. They are as necessary to a professional man as to a merchant; as necessary to ladies as to gentlemen; as necessary for the government of a family as for the government of a commercial establishment. The greater the intellectual talents of the individual, the more necessary are habits of business to keep him steady in his course. The more canvas he spreads, the more ballast he requires. If we examine the history of those illustrious characters who have risen to eminence, as the masters, the legislators, or the instructors of mankind, we shall find they have been as much distinguished by their habits of business as by the superiority of their intellect. While, on the other hand, we could easily point out, in every science and in every path of life, some young men who, though of towering genius, have become lost to themselves, and have disappointed the hopes of all their friends through a want of habits of business. They have burst upon the world with more than noontide splendour; they have attracted universal notice; they have excited big expectations, and suddenly they have darted into an oblique course and passed into oblivion.

5. The Greeks were fond of amusement, and kept many holidays. The ancient nations were chiefly agricultural, and in all agricultural nations holidays are numerous in the

intervals between the seasons of agricultural labour. As nations became commercial, the number of holidays was reduced. The operations of commerce are more uniform throughout the year, and time at all seasons is valuable, and hence the annual amount of labour is considerably increased.

Too many holidays are a national evil. They consume time that might be usefully employed,—they destroy the habit of industry, so that even the labour of the working days is less productive,—and they often lead to immoral practices. On the other hand, incessant labour has a tendency to impair the faculties of both body and mind. Intervals of recreation are essential to health. It is perhaps essential to healthy and vigorous existence that a portion of every day should be passed in amusement, or at least in some kind of exercise different from that required by our professional calling. And he who employs a portion of the day in improving his mental powers, or in acquiring knowledge, even when that knowledge has no immediate reference to his profession, is more likely to acquire professional distinction than he who blunts his powers by a course of monotonous exertion.

The amusements of a merchant should correspond with his character. He should never engage in those recreations which partake of the nature of gambling, and but seldom in those of a frivolous description. A judge is not always on the bench, a clergyman is not always in the pulpit, nor is a merchant always on 'change; but each is expected to abstain at all times from any amusements which are not consistent with his professional character. The credit of a merchant depends not merely on his wealth, but upon the opinion generally entertained of his personal qualities, and he should cultivate a reputation for prudence and propriety of conduct as part of his stock in trade.

There is one holiday which a merchant should always observe—he should always observe the Sabbath-day.

The design of the Sabbath is to insure an interval of bodily repose, more especially for the humbler classes of society; to change the current of thought, and thus to preserve the mental powers in a state of vigour and freshness; to give leisure for

reflection, and thus enable man to look above him, and around him, and within him, and consider his own character and destiny; and to furnish opportunity for the discharge of those duties of piety, of kindness, and of benevolence, which devolve upon him as a moral and religious being.

The institution of the Sabbath day must not be regarded as diminishing the sum of annual labour. By improving the habits and invigorating the mental powers, it increases the annual produce of labour, both in regard to nations and individuals.

The labour of Sunday tends not to wealth. It is not the man who "adds Sunday to the week" of toil, who employs that holy day in attending to his ordinary business or in making up his books—no, it is not he who is in the surest road to riches. It is the man who when the Sunday dawns feels his mind expand with new and exhilarating and ennobling associations; who, accompanied by his family, appropriately attired, pays his morning homage in the temple of religion, and passes the remainder of the day in works of charity or piety, or in innocent relaxations corresponding with the sanctity of the day—that is the man who, by improving the intellectual, the moral, and the social faculties of his mind, is adopting the surest means of acquiring wealth and respectability in the world.

They greatly err who imagine they are pleading the cause of the poor when they endeavour to remove the religious sanctions of the Sabbath-day. Should the mass of the population once entertain the impression that the observance of Sunday is not required by religion, but is merely a matter of convenience or expediency, the poor will then have no security for cessation from toil. Reasons will soon be found, based apparently upon a regard for the poor, for increasing their labour. Let the Sunday be regarded no longer as a day of devotion, but merely as a day of pleasure, and it will soon become a day of toil.

Were the Sunday abolished, the poor man would receive no more wages for his seven days' labour than he now does for his six. His scale of comforts would be reduced, as he would

have no occasion for a Sunday's attire. His opportunities of social intercourse and of moral improvement would be abolished. In this and in other cases it is shown that religion, while she is the guide and solace of the wealthy, is pre-eminently the friend and guardian of the poor.

6. The Greeks were proficients in knowledge. They excelled, not only in those sciences which depend on taste and imagination, such as the fine arts, but also in those which depend on the abstract powers of the intellect, such as logic and geometry. In some others they were inferior to the moderns. In the various branches of natural philosophy they were much inferior, especially in chemistry. Electricity and galvanism were wholly unknown. In natural history, botany, and mineralogy, their knowledge was limited. In mathematics, they understood algebra and geometry, but were unacquainted with logarithms and fluxions. In astronomy and navigation they were unequal to the moderns, and also in the mechanical arts. Though Archimedes had machines by which he could raise a ship out of water, yet the Greeks were ignorant of the power of steam, and seem never to have applied the pressure of the atmosphere, the force of the wind, or of a current of water to any of their mechanical engines. The various philosophical instruments we possess, such as telescopes, microscopes, barometers, thermometers, and others, though they have names derived from the Greek language, are the invention of modern times. But though unacquainted with recent discoveries, the Greeks manifested in the sciences they studied the highest degree of intellectual strength. Nothing shows more strongly the power of MIND than the influence which, after the lapse of thousands of years, the Greeks still possess in our own days. The demonstrations of Euclid still bear sway in our schools. Aristotle still regulates our mode of thinking and of reasoning. Homer is still regarded as the first of poets, and Demosthenes as the first of orators; while our architects and our sculptors are not the rivals, but only the imitators of those of ancient Greece.

Knowledge is necessary to a merchant. The same kind of knowledge which is necessary to a statesman is necessary to a

merchant. To carry on extensive commerce he must be acquainted with the productions of every part of the world. He should know where any commodity is found in abundance, and where it is deficient;—what are the habits and opinions of all the nations of the earth; and what will be the effect of any proposed measures or of passing events upon different branches of trade. Such is now the rapidity of communication, that the events of a distant part of the world may affect the price of an article even of home growth. The price of whiskey, for instance, in Waterford, may be affected by the produce of the sugar crops in the West Indies—the harvest of Russia—the vineyards of Portugal or of France. Ignorance of other countries may involve the merchant in serious loss. It would be a bad speculation to send a cargo of wine to Turkey, for the Mahometans are forbidden to drink wine. Soon after the independence of the South American colonies, some merchants sent out a large quantity of machinery to work the mines of Peru, but they were so unacquainted with the country that they did not know that there were no roads leading to the mining districts, and the people had no wheel-carriages, hence the steam-engines were left to rust on the coast. I have been told by a provision merchant that the price of bacon in Waterford is affected by the price of cabbages in London. The English people are in the habit of eating bacon and cabbage together; and, when there is an abundant crop of cabbages in England, there is a greater demand for Irish bacon. But a merchant should not only have an extensive knowledge of facts, but also of principles. Not only should he be acquainted with the natural history of the commodities in which he deals, and the various processes they undergo before they become articles of merchandize—not only should he know the habits, tastes, characters, and mercantile laws of the various nations of the earth, he ought also to study the various circumstances which influence the rate of wages, the fluctuations of prices, the scale of profit, and the value of money, and also the effects of the imposition and abolition of taxes, and the general principles of national finance.

In conclusion, we may remark, that commerce has been in our time the chief means of extending the knowledge of the arts and sciences. No new discovery can be made in the sciences, or any new invention in the arts, but by means of our extensive commerce it is quickly known throughout the world. The winds of commerce have wafted the seeds of science to every land; they have fallen and taken root, and in every country they have visited we now see the trees of knowledge stretching wide their branches, adorned with blossoms and laden with fruit.

Our extended commerce furnishes one of the surest guarantees for the permanence of modern science. Greece and Rome were overthrown, and the sciences were buried beneath their ruins. But modern science depends not upon the conquest of a city or the subversion of an empire. If the present seats of science should again be deluged with barbarism, Commerce would receive into her ark the germ of every science, and perpetuate in distant regions every species of intellectual excellence.

Not only may we expect that modern civilization will be permanent, but we may expect that it will increase. When we see what a spirit of daring enterprise is diffused by commerce throughout the whole population—when we see what mighty powers are daily engaged in endeavouring to enlarge the boundaries of science—when we see what exertions are making to extend education throughout all classes of the community—who can tell what will be the result?—who can tell but that the lower classes will be raised as high in knowledge as the higher classes, and the knowledge of the higher classes be proportionably advanced—that this will be the case not only in one nation but in every nation—and that the whole world, in this high state of improvement, shall go on to make further and still further discoveries, until human society shall attain a degree of perfection of which we have now no conception? Who can tell but the human mind, thus placed in new circumstances, shall exhibit powers which it is not now known to possess, and society shall be advanced as far above its present state of civilization as its present

state is superior to that of the savage? Who can say to the human mind—Thus far shalt thou advance, but no farther? Go, arrest the motion of the winds—stop the diurnal revolution of the earth, or stay the planets in their course. Do this, and then—but not till then—hope to arrest the progress of the human mind. Great is truth, and it shall prevail. As certain as the laws of nature—as certain as the appearance of Aurora foretells the rising sun—so sure shall the present twilight of knowledge be succeeded by the blazing splendours of meridian day.

LECTURE III.

THE COMMERCE OF TYRE AND CARTHAGE.

Origin of Navigation. Rise of Tyre and Carthage—Maritime Power—Influence of Navigation on Commerce—Advantages of an Insular Situation—Ships of the Ancients—Long Voyages—Carrying Trade. Manufactures—Weaving—Dyeing—Pottery—Tanning—Working of Metals. Colonies—Colonial Trade—Rate of Wages—Emigration. Accumulation of Capital—Credit—Banking—Bottomry—Partnerships—Joint Stock Companies. Commercial Character of the Carthaginians.

In the first Lecture were laid down some of the elementary principles of commercial science. We stated that the commerce of a country depended on its productions—on its consumption—on its position—on its means of communication—on the state of its arts and sciences—on the nature of its laws, and on the genius and character of the people. We endeavoured to illustrate these propositions by facts taken from the history of Ancient Egypt. In my last Lecture we traced the progress of society from an uncivilized to a commercial state; we viewed the establishment of the right of private property—the administration of justice—the founding of cities—the appointment of markets and fairs—and the introduction of money and bankers. These principles we endeavoured to illustrate by facts taken from the history of Ancient Greece. We now view society arrived at a state of maturity. Property is respected—the laws are enforced—the arts and sciences are cultivated—the necessaries of life are acquired—a taste for luxury has arisen—and the people are looking about in quest of the means to enrich themselves with those productions which their own soil and climate cannot supply.

If we wish to trace the means by which these desires are gratified, how can we do better than investigate the history of Tyre and of Carthage?

The country called Phœnicia was situated on the coast of the Mediterranean Sea, to the north-west of Canaan, and to the south-west of Syria. The territory was but small, and, like most other ancient countries, was at first subdivided into several independent states. The two largest cities were Tyre and Sidon. Old Tyre was situated on the land, and withstood a siege for thirteen years by Nebuchadnezzar. Ultimately it was taken; but the Tyrians having the command of the sea, removed themselves, their families, and their property, before Nebuchadnezzar could take possession of the place. The Tyrians afterwards returned, and built New Tyre, which was at a little distance from the land, and was founded on a rock about three miles in circumference. This new city was besieged by Alexander the Great, and taken, with great slaughter, after a siege of seven months. Tyre is thus described in the Holy Scriptures:—"A joyous city, whose antiquity is of ancient days, whose merchants are princes, whose traffickers are the honourable of the earth."—"Tyrus did build herself a stronghold, and heaped up silver as the dust, and fine gold as the mire of the street. When the waves went forth out of the seas, thou filledst many people; thou didst enrich the kings of the earth with the multitude of thy riches and of thy merchandize." Tyre carried on a considerable traffic with the adjacent country of Judea. Solomon, king of Israel, made a treaty with Hiram, king of Tyre, by virtue of which the Tyrians hewed timber in the forest of Lebanon, and brought it down in fleets to Joppa, from whence it was carried to Jerusalem, to construct the Temple, and other public buildings; and in return Solomon supplied Hiram annually with wheat and barley, and wine and oil, all of which Judea produced in abundance. Afterwards, when Solomon fitted out a fleet at Eziongeber to go to Tarshish, Hiram furnished him with sailors, as the Tyrians understood maritime affairs much better than the Israelites. In a subsequent period, after the division of the ten tribes,

Ahab, the king of Israel, married Jezebel, the daughter of Ethbaal, king of Sidon, and introduced the worship of Baal the god of the Sidonians; and afterwards the worship of the same idol was introduced by her daughter, Athaliah, into the kingdom of Judah. At a still later period in the Jewish history, we find the Tyrians brought fish, and all manner of wares to Jerusalem, and were threatened with punishment by Nehemiah for exposing them for sale on the Sabbath day.

The Tyrians were remarkable for their knowledge of navigation, their skill in manufactures, and the extent of their commerce. The most ample account we have of the commerce of ancient Tyre is contained in the 27th chapter of the Prophecy of Ezekiel. In the prosecution of their commerce they found it useful to establish colonies for conducting their trade with those countries in which the colonists were settled. They are said to have planted above forty colonies on different parts of the coast of the Mediterranean Sea. In point of government these colonies, like those of Greece, were independent of the mother country, and had the entire management of their own affairs. Among these colonies, the most celebrated is Carthage.

Carthage stood on the coast of Africa, at about half-way from Phœnicia to the straits of Cadiz. It was situated on a peninsula, about forty-five miles in circumference, which joined the main continent by a neck of land about three miles across. The city, in the zenith of its greatness, was about twenty-three miles in circumference, and contained a population of about 700,000 people. At this time it held dominion over all the coasts of Africa, a territory above 1,400 miles in length, and containing three hundred cities; it also possessed the greater part of Spain and Sicily, and all the islands in the Mediterranean Sea to the Strait of Sicily. This extensive empire was not acquired so much by conquest as by commerce and colonization. The government, like that of most ancient states, was republican, but what is remarkable, and what distinguishes it from other ancient republics is, that during the whole six hundred years of its existence,

there was no instance of a civil war. Ancient writers attribute this to the excellency of the Carthaginian political constitution, but it was probably owing to the good sense and commercial habits of the people.

The Carthaginians excelled in the arts and sciences, but all the monuments of their greatness were destroyed by the Romans. We have no account of the Carthaginians except from Greek and Roman writers, the latter of whom were their enemies and destroyers. Had we as minute an account of the rise and progress of Carthage, as we have of Greece and of Rome, it would probably form the most useful branch of ancient history.

The following account is given of their trade:—"The commodities they supplied other nations with in great abundance seem to have been corn, and fruits of all kinds, divers sorts of provisions, and high sauces, wax, honey, oil, the skins of wild beasts, &c., all the natural produce of their own territories. Their staple manufactures were utensils, toys, cables, made of the shrub Spartum, a kind of broom, all kinds of naval stores, and the colour called Punic, the preparation of which seems to have been peculiar to them. From Egypt they fetched fine flax, paper, &c.; from the coasts of the Red Sea, spices, frankincense, perfumes, gold, pearls, and precious stones. From Syria and Phœnicia, purple, scarlet, with stuff tapestry, and costly furniture; and from the western parts of the world, in return for the commodities carried thither, they brought back iron, tin, lead, copper, &c. So famous was Carthage for its artificers, that any singular invention or exquisite piece of workmanship, seems to have been called Punic even by the Romans. Thus the Punic beds or couches, the Punic windows, the Punic winepresses, the Punic lanterns, were esteemed the more neat and elegant by that people."

The history of Carthage, even imperfect as it is, seems adapted to teach us those means by which nations arrive at an extensive commerce. These means will form the topics of the present Lecture. I observe, then—

First. Commerce is extended by means of maritime power.

Secondly. Commerce is extended by means of the establishment of manufactures.

Thirdly. Commerce is extended by the planting of colonies.

Fourthly. Commerce is extended by the accumulation of capital.

These will form the four heads of my lecture. I begin with the first:—

I. Commerce is extended by means of maritime power.

In warm climates the necessity of cleanliness is so great, that bathing in water was in almost all countries enjoined as a religious duty. From bathing in water, and from seeing other animals, man would soon acquire the art of swimming. At the same time he would occasionally see branches of trees, broken down by the wind, carried along the current, and this would suggest to him the idea of making a canoe or boat by cutting out a hollow in the trunk of a tree. Hence we find that the art of navigation commenced in warm countries. When the art of constructing boats was once discovered, fresh improvements would necessarily be introduced as mankind improved in the arts and sciences, and as they had occasion to make longer voyages. From the construction of vessels adapted only to carry themselves, mankind would proceed to the construction of vessels adapted to carry cargoes of commodities. Hence navigation would be employed as a means of trade. It would soon be found that very heavy bodies could be floated down a river in less time and at a less expense than it could be conveyed by land; trade would extend, and ship-building and navigation would improve. Those families of mankind who resided on the sea-coasts would become habituated to a maritime life, and the sea would be regarded as a source of wealth and power.

Navigation has a great influence on commerce. Commerce consists in an exchange of the superabundant productions of different countries. But two countries situated near to each other, having the same climate and the same soil, will produce nearly the same kind of commodities, and but little commerce may take place between them; while countries situated at a

distance from each other, and in different climates, will produce very different commodities, and here is the foundation of an extended commerce. But commerce cannot very well be carried on between two distant countries by land. There would be great delay, and great expense, and great liability to interruption or robbery from the inhabitants of the lands through which you pass. All these inconveniences are obviated by means of a sea voyage. The transportation of goods is effected with less expense, in less time, and is less liable to interruption. In consequence of these facilities, the goods imported or exported can be sold at a cheaper rate. This tends to increase the demand for them, and commerce is thus more widely extended.

In most cases, an island presents greater advantages for commerce than a country situated on a continent. In proportion to its size, an island has a larger extent of sea coast than any continental country can have. The climate is usually milder and more even, so that the operations of commerce are not disturbed by the seasons. The sea is a natural fortification, so that there is less danger of an invasion from a foreign enemy, and a less proportion of the population are required to be enlisted in the army. And, as all commerce with other nations is necessarily carried on by sea, the inhabitants naturally acquire maritime habits ; ship-building and navigation are more generally studied, and the people have more skill and courage in maritime warfare. In ancient history, the islands of Crete, Rhodes, and Cyprus were celebrated for their commerce.

Islands have also the advantage of being able to carry on the trade between the several provinces by sea. What in other countries is an inland trade, and is conducted by means of roads and canals, is, in islands, a coasting trade. An interchange of commodities between the different parts of the country is effected, by means of shipping, in less time and at a less expense.

The vessels of the ancients were different from those of modern times. The Grecian seas were land-locked, filled with small islands, and subject to violent storms and frequent

calms; hence sails were not generally used. Their ships were rowed by oars, and in sailing the mariners kept near to the coasts. Ships of war were called long ships—those of burden were called round ships. The ships of the Phœnicians being adapted for commerce, were broader and deeper than those intended for war. In the time of Homer, hempen cordage seems to have been unknown; leathern thongs were used instead; and the ships had only one mast, and that a moveable one. The greatest number of men on board any one ship was one hundred and twenty. Navigation was in its infancy; but the principal constellations had been observed, and by means of these the Greeks had navigated as far as Cyprus, Phœnicia, and Egypt.

Ships had usually several banks of oars rising one above another, in the manner of stairs. On going on board a ship, you would first step on the side. This was the first bank of oars. Here the rowers had short oars. The next step was higher and farther from the sea. This was the second bank of oars. Here the rowers had longer oars. The next step was the third bank of oars. Here the rowers had still longer oars, and, consequently, the work was harder, and the men had higher pay. Some of the ancient ships had two rudders on each side—afterwards they had a rudder at each end; but at length they had a rudder only in the stern, and the prow or bow of the ship became ornamented with a figure-head. The ships of war were not adapted for carrying any cargo; the chief object was swiftness in rowing. The men could never sleep, nor even conveniently eat on board. In their naval expeditions they kept close to the shore, and landed to take their meals. When about to engage, they took down their sail, and depended entirely on their oars, as they could then advance or retreat, according to circumstances. The ships of war being long and narrow, and crowded with men, could not bear up against a high wind; but the ships of burden, or the round ships, as they were called, were adapted for the wind; they were worked by fewer hands, and fit for long voyages. The principal vessels used at first, were triremes, or ships with three banks of oars; but the Phœ-

nicians or the Carthaginians constructed vessels of four and even five banks of oars; vessels built for stateliness and show had sometimes a greater number. Ships of war had, usually, a beak of wood covered with brass placed on their prows, for the purpose of annoying the ships of the enemy.

The ships of Tyre are thus described by the Prophet Ezekiel:—"They have made all thy ship boards of fir-trees of Senir; they have taken cedars from Lebanon to make masts for thee. Of the oaks of Bashan have they made thine oars. The company of the Ashurites have made thy benches of ivory, brought out of the isles of Chittim. Fine linen, with broidered work from Egypt, was that which thou spreadest forth to be thy sail—blue and purple from the isles of Elishah was that which covered thee. The inhabitants of Zidon and Arpad were thy mariners—thy wise men, O Tyre, that were in thee, were thy pilots."

The Greeks confined their navigation entirely to their own seas. Even Sicily was, for many ages, the land of fable and monsters with which they were utterly unacquainted. But the Phœnicians extended their voyages throughout the whole of the Mediterranean; they passed through the Straits of Gibraltar, and visited the coasts of Britain. These voyages required ships of a larger size, and also a superior knowledge of navigation. It seemed, however, that whenever they could they kept near to the shore. You are aware that in the Mediterranean Sea there are no tides, but a current is always running into the German Ocean. On passing into the ocean, a different kind of navigation might become necessary. A trade that will pay the expense of a long voyage must be a profitable one, as there must be a greater outlay of capital in the equipment, and a longer period before it can be realized. In trading with the uncivilized nations of Britain, the Phœnicians appear to have exchanged commodities of but comparatively little value, for those which to them were of considerable worth. They brought to England salt, and earthenware, and trinkets made of brass; and took tin, hides, and wool. The trade was so valuable that the Carthaginians

kept it to themselves. A Roman ship followed a Carthaginian ship to discover the place to which she sailed. The Carthaginian captain designedly ran his ship aground, the Roman ship followed, and ran aground also. The Carthaginian captain threw out his cargo, and got his ship off. The Senate of Carthage commended his conduct and made good his loss.

The Carthaginians not only traded directly with the places they visited, but they also conducted the trade between those places, buying at one place and selling at the others. This is now usually called the carrying trade. Countries may have commodities sufficient to form the basis of an extensive commerce, and yet may not have sufficient capital to export them. Thus, the American Indians could furnish abundance of fur, but had no ships; and if there be two nations in this state, it is a great advantage to both if any third nation will undertake to carry their respective exports for the consumption of the other. The Dutch had for a considerable time the carrying trade of Europe. Even now, the Americans will bring tea from China and sell it in France. The bonding system of England resembles a carrying trade, for goods may be brought from one country, placed in bond for a while, and then exported, without duty, to another country. The Carthaginians possessed this kind of trade. They might take from England tin, which they might exchange in Egypt for linen cloth; they might take corn from Egypt to Spain, and take gold from Spain to Egypt. As they did not carry for hire, but were dealers in all these commodities, they acquired a profit on all the trade carried on with these respective nations, and they obtained all these advantages by means of their maritime power.

Secondly. I observe, that commerce is extended by the establishment of manufactures.

A commodity is said to be manufactured when it has undergone some change in consequence of the application of human labour. The material of the manufacture is called raw material. Thus cloth is a manufacture, and wool is the raw material. Flour is called a manufacture, the corn being

raw material. So, in Waterford, we often hear bacon called the manufactured article, pigs, of course, being the raw material.

Some manufactures, however, are made from materials previously manufactured. Thus, we speak of a glove manufacture, the manufacture of shoes and of nails, although the materials, leather and iron, had previously been manufactured.

The word manufacture signifies made with the hand, a term not now exactly appropriate, as most of our manufactures are made in a great degree by machinery. A *Manufacturer* is a person who makes articles in great quantities, and sells them wholesale. A *Maker* makes only a few articles, and sells them immediately to the consumers.

All countries have some kind of manufacture for the use of its inhabitants. But, by a manufacturing country, we generally mean a country that manufactures goods not merely for its own consumption, but also for exportation to other nations. A nation which can thus increase its surplus productions, will, of course, increase its exports. By this means too, it will also increase its imports, because it will be able to purchase a larger quantity of the productions of other nations. All nations that have become manufacturing nations have become commercial nations; and have, consequently, become wealthy.

Manufacturing nations rise to wealth from the additional value which they give to the raw materials; for there is an immense difference between the value of the raw materials and the value of the same materials in a manufactured state. Thus, for instance, it has been stated that a pound of cotton wool, when spun, has been worth five pounds sterling; and when wove into muslin, and ornamented in the tambour, is worth fifteen pounds, yielding 5,900*l.* per cent. on the raw material. An ounce of fine Flanders thread has been sold in London for four pounds. Such an ounce made into lace may be sold for forty pounds, which is ten times the price of standard gold, weight for weight. Steel may be made three hundred times dearer than standard gold, weight for weight.

Six steel wire springs for pendulums of chronometer watches weigh one grain, costing the artist seven shillings and sixpence each, equal to two pounds five shillings. One grain of gold costs only twopence. So a service of cut glass, or of fine porcelain, will cost many hundred times the value of the raw materials of which it is composed. Mr. Babbage also states—that the pendulum spring of a watch, which governs the vibrations of the balance, costs at the retail price, twopence, and weighs $\frac{15}{100}$ of a grain, while the retail price of a pound of the best iron, the raw material out of which 50,000 such springs are made, is exactly the same sum of twopence. A quantity of lead that cost one pound, when manufactured into small printing type, will sell for twenty-eight pounds. A quantity of bar iron that cost one pound, when made into needles will sell for seventy pounds; into the finest kind of scissors it will sell for 446*l.*; as gun barrels it will sell for 238*l.*; as blades of penknives, 657*l.*; as sword handles, or polished steel, 972*l.* He likewise states that four men, four women, and two children are able to make above 5,500 pins in less than eight hours.

Now you are not to suppose that the manufacturers of these articles get higher profits than other manufacturers do. Their high prices arise from the immense quantity of labour which is expended upon them. And this is the reason why manufacturing nations get wealthy, because they give employment to the whole population. Men, women, and children, all are employed, and every day, and all day long, and part of the night too, without any interruption from the weather, or the change of season. The effect on national wealth may be thus illustrated. If I had an estate so fertile, that for every bushel of seed I should have a crop of 600 bushels, I should soon get rich. But if for the price of a bushel of wheat I can buy a quantity of raw material, and by the labour I bestow upon it, I can sell it for the price of 600 bushels, it is the same thing to me as though I had an estate which yielded a crop of 600-fold. In manufactures, too, you can introduce a greater quantity of machinery. As all the additional value bestowed upon the raw material is derived

from labour, men have racked their minds to make the most of labour, to increase its power by subdivision, and to invent machines by which the rivers, the winds, the air, and steam are compelled to do the work of men. Similar machinery has in some cases been introduced into agriculture, but it cannot be adopted to the same extent. Agriculture labours under this disadvantage, that whatever machinery we apply, all we can do is to increase the crop, and to cheapen some of the operations; we cannot quicken the process, at least, not to any extent. We may by machinery weave a piece of cotton or silk, or make a pair of razors in half the time heretofore employed, but we cannot make a field produce a crop of wheat, barley, or potatoes in half the usual time. Seed time and harvest will go on, and the operations of nature will not be stimulated, to any great extent, by any machinery we can apply.

When a manufacture is established in any country, it is usually in consequence of that country possessing either an abundance of the raw material, or a facility for manufacturing it. Thus, an iron manufacture will scarcely ever be established, except in a country that produces iron stone, and even that will not be sufficient, unless it also produce coal or wood. Ores cannot be smelted without fire; all the copper ore in the county of Cornwall is taken to Swansea to be smelted, for Cornwall produces no coal. So copper ore is brought from South America to Liverpool to be smelted, because there is no coal in that part of America.

But where there are great facilities for the manufacture, manufactories may be established in countries which do not produce the raw material. England produces no cotton, and yet has an immense cotton manufacture; but the moving power in all our cotton manufactories is steam: steam is made by fire, and fire by coal; hence the coal-mines of England are the cause of her having the manufacture of cotton.

When a country has, from its physical advantages, or from the ingenuity of its people, acquired the art of manufacturing any articles cheaper and better than other nations, then those other nations will, in most cases, find it their interest to

apply their own labour and capital to those pursuits in which they have an advantage, and so purchase the manufactured commodities rather than manufacture for themselves. Hence manufactures promote commerce.

The manufactures in which Tyre and Carthage excelled, were weaving, dyeing, pottery, tanning, and the working of metals.

One of the most ancient arts is that of weaving. Although mankind at first clothed themselves with the skins of beasts, they soon learned the art of spinning wool and weaving it into cloth. Among all ancient nations this was performed by the female members of the family.

Both in profane and sacred history, weaving is referred to and recorded as the employment of ladies of the most illustrious rank. In the last chapter of Proverbs, where we have an enumeration of the qualities of a good wife, she is said to take wool and flax and work willingly with her hands, "and she not only supplied her own household, but also delivered girdles unto the merchant." In the middle ages, a similar practice existed; and even to this day the legal title of an unmarried lady is a "spinster."

Although the Egyptians were celebrated for the manufacture of linen, and the Phœnicians for the manufacture of woollen, it is not likely that either of them had any manufactories in the sense in which we use the term. We know very well that the north of Ireland has for many years been remarkable for the manufacture of linen, and yet it is only very recently that manufactories have been erected at Belfast, where an attempt has been made to apply the machinery used in the manufacture of cotton to the manufacture of linen. The linen is spun at home by women, and wove at home generally by men. It is then brought to market in small quantities and purchased by the bleachers, who prepare it for the market. In a similar manner, probably, was the linen and woollen manufacture carried on in ancient times. When Moses wanted coverings for the Tabernacle, which he erected immediately after the Israelites came out of Egypt, he did not order them of a manufacturer, but "all the women

that were wise-hearted did spin with their hands, and brought that which they had spun, both of blue, and of purple, and of scarlet, and of fine linen."

In ancient times the common people wore both their garments, the tunic and the mantle, of the natural colour of the wool, without any kind of dyeing; but the more wealthy had their garments dyed of various colours. The most esteemed was the purple, hence the Roman emperors always wore purple, and a purple robe became the emblem of royalty. When soliciting the votes of their fellow-citizens, the Romans wore a white garment; the Latin word for white is *candidus*, hence they were called candidates. The word candidate literally means a man in a white cloak.

The Tyrians at a very early age became renowned for the beauty of their dyes, and they retained this character for a considerable period. In fact, secrets in dyeing are more easily kept than secrets in most other trades. Dyes usually require an intermediate substance, called a "mordant." This word means a biter. This substance bites the cloth and bites the dye, and so keeps them both together. If you dye a piece of cloth with any colour without using a mordant, the colour will come out on the first washing. The great secret of dyeing is to find out what particular mordant is adapted to each particular dye: for different mordants will produce different colours, even with the same dye. If you dip a piece of cloth in a solution of alum, which is a very common mordant, and then dye it with cochineal, it will produce a beautiful scarlet; but if you dip it in oxide of iron, and then dye it with cochineal, it will be a perfect black. Sometimes a colour will be produced different from that of either the mordant or the dye. If you boil a piece of cloth in a blue mordant, and then dip it in a yellow dye, the colour produced will not be either blue or yellow, but a perfect green. What kind of substances the Phœnicians used to produce their colours is now unknown. Their most beautiful purple is supposed to have been obtained from some part of a fish, then found in the Mediterranean Sea; but the mode of its preparation is now unknown.

The ancients highly esteemed the art of dyeing. Jacob gave to his favourite son Joseph a coat of many colours. The tabernacle, made by the Israelites in the wilderness, had curtains of fine twined linen, and blue and purple and scarlet. The mother of Sisera anticipated the return of her son arrayed in a garment of divers colours—of divers colours of needlework on both sides, meet for the necks of them that take the spoil. The veil of Solomon's temple was made of blue and purple and crimson and fine linen. Kings wore a purple robe. "Mordecai went out from the presence of the king in royal apparel of blue and white, and with a great crown of gold, and with a garment of fine linen and purple." The prophet Ezekiel, in addressing Tyre, said, "Blue and purple was that which covered thee." And, in the New Testament, a certain rich man is described as one who was clothed in purple and fine linen and fared sumptuously every day.

Earthenware is mentioned as one of the articles imported by the Carthaginians into England. This art appears to have been known at a very early period in the history of the world. Potter's vessels are mentioned in the Jewish history, and the Hebrew poets often refer to them as an emblem of fragility. "Thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel."—The prophet Jeremiah describes the process of this manufacture, and it appears that "earthen pitchers" were but little esteemed. In our own time, we are aware to what a degree of elegance and perfection the manufacture of earthenware may be carried, and in this art the Phœnicians are said to have eminently excelled.

As soon as mankind had learned to use the skins of beasts, they would acquire some knowledge of the art of tanning. At a very early period we read of leather. Before the discovery of hempen cordage, thongs of leather were used for ropes; and leather was also employed in the making of bottles. Hence we read that, "no man putteth new wine into old bottles—the bottles will burst; but new wine must be put into new bottles, and both are preserved." Our first parents were clothed with skins, and, as this occurred before

the permission to eat animal food, it is presumed that these were the skins of animals which had been offered in sacrifice.

The Carthaginians appear to have had a perfect knowledge of the working of metals. They employed above 40,000 men in the mines of Spain, from which they obtained gold, silver, copper, and tin; afterwards they obtained tin in greater abundance from the mines of Cornwall. They regularly visited England, taking thence tin, skins, and wool, and leaving in exchange salt, earthenware, and utensils made of brass. It is a singular circumstance, that although the county of Cornwall contains copper in as great quantities as tin, yet this appears to have been quite unknown at the time of the Carthaginians. The English actually imported all the brass instruments they used. The people were probably unacquainted with the mode of smelting copper, especially as the county of Cornwall produces neither coals nor wood. The extraction of copper from the ore is a much more severe process than the extraction of tin; and copper again is extracted with less difficulty than iron. The Tyrians are said by Ezekiel to have obtained from Tarshish, silver, iron, tin, and lead. They obtained iron also from Dan and Jovan. Some of the arts for which the Phœnicians were remarkable, are enumerated in the letter addressed by Solomon to Hiram, King of Tyre. "Send me now therefore a man cunning to work in gold and in silver, and in brass and in iron, and in purple and crimson and blue; and that can skill to grave with the cunning men that are with me in Judah and Jerusalem, whom David, my father, did provide. Send me also cedar-trees, fir-trees, and algum-trees out of Lebanon, for I know that thy servants have skill to cut timber in Lebanon."

Thirdly. Commerce is extended by the planting of colonies.

Commerce is considerably promoted by a wise system of colonization. If we are in the habit of importing any articles of commerce from a distant country, it is evident our trade is liable to many interruptions. Political differences may arise with its government, or for some other reason it may give a preference to other nations. Our rivals may

have exemptions from customs, or other privileges which are not granted to us, and hence we may be unable to obtain its productions at so cheap a rate as before. On the other hand, if we have been in the habit of supplying this country with the productions of our own, we may be supplanted by others, who may send similar articles to the same market, and who may be favoured with peculiar privileges. But if this distant country be one of our colonies, neither of these effects can occur. Its productions cannot then be taken from us by exclusive privileges being granted to foreigners, nor can we be deprived of this market for the produce of our home industry. It may be desirable to possess colonies, even when the articles produced are of the same kind as those which are produced in the mother country. As population increases, the price of raw materials increases; the quantity of land taken into tillage diminishes that which remains for pasture, and this occasions a rise in the price of cattle, and, consequently, of leather, of hides, of horns, of tallow, and of other materials. As, too, the community, to supply itself with food, takes additional quantities of land into tillage, it is compelled to cultivate poorer soils; and, from the increased expense of cultivation, an advance will take place in the price of provisions. Hence, it follows, that in a thickly-populous nation, the inhabitants of which are fed by the products of their own soil, provisions must be at a high price. To a country thus thickly populated, where all the most fertile lands are in a state of cultivation, and where the people are engaged in manufactures, it must be a great advantage to find a country possessing immense tracts of fertile land, on which food may be raised at a comparatively trifling expense, and which can easily be made to produce raw materials for the support of the manufacturers of the mother country. In this newly-discovered country colonies may be established. The colonists would select the most fertile spots for tillage—the pasturage for their cattle would cost them nothing—they would have no rent to pay, and would be exempted from those taxes which necessarily exist in all old-established countries. With these advantages, it

is evident that the colony could produce corn and other raw materials, which, after paying the expenses of freight, might be sold at a much lower price than that at which they could be produced by the mother country. Hence it would be for the advantage of the parent state to draw its raw produce from the colonies, and supply them with manufactured goods.

The Greeks established colonies for the purpose of getting rid of a superabundant population, and their colonies soon became independent. The Roman colonies were established partly for the same purpose, and partly for the purpose of acting as garrisons, and thus keeping possession of the countries they had conquered. The Tyrians and Carthaginians established colonies for the purpose of extending their trade. The Tyrians are said to have planted forty colonies in different parts of the Mediterranean; and the Carthaginians periodically sent out a number of their citizens in new places where they thought an advantageous trade might be opened. These small colonists were probably at first little more than factors and agents. In this way the English at first colonized some parts of North America. They traded to America for fur; but the Indians did not think of getting the fur until the ships had arrived. Hence the importers appointed persons to remain in the country during the winter and collect fur against the return of the season. The Indians brought the fur to these settlements. The number of settlers increased. The animals from whose skins the furs were obtained soon diminished in number. It was necessary for the Indians to proceed further inland. A fresh settlement of colonists was made further up the country. The first settlement became a city, and was surrounded by a variety of smaller settlements; and thus, in course of time, the whole territory between these different settlements became subject to the mother country.

Colonial, like all other trade, must consist of imports and exports. The imports from colonies consist of those commodities which either cannot be produced in the mother country, or which cannot be produced in sufficient quantity. The Carthaginians imported gold and silver from Spain; tin

from England; iron, silk, fur, and other articles which were not found in Carthage. But the mother country also imported those things which she produced, but not in sufficient quantity. These were chiefly corn, wool, fur, timber, and the various metals. These are called raw produce. They are the materials of manufacture; and they can almost always be produced at a cheaper rate in a colony than in an old country.

While the imports from the colony will consist of raw produce, the exports to the colony will consist of manufactured goods; for though newly-peopled countries have the advantage in raising raw produce, yet old countries have the advantage in manufactures. There the people are collected into cities; the division of labour is more complete; machinery is more perfect, and the processes are better understood. The mother country has then a double advantage from the colony. She has an advantage in obtaining raw products at a cheaper rate than she otherwise could obtain them, and she has an advantage of obtaining a certain market for her own manufactured produce. Again, the colony has a double advantage from the mother country. The colony has the advantage of a market for her raw produce in the mother country, and also the advantage of obtaining from the mother country manufactured goods cheaper and better than they could be made in the colony. The trade, therefore, between mother country and colony is of the same kind as that which is carried on between town and country—it is an exchange of produce between the farmer and the artisan. The colony sends her produce to the mother country as a farmer brings with him the produce of his fields to the market-town, and takes back those articles which are supplied by the workshops of the town.

The rate of wages is regulated by the proportion that may exist between the demand for labour and the supply. In all old and thickly-peopled countries, the supply of labour usually exceeds the demand, and hence wages are low; in new colonies the demand exceeds the supply, and wages are high. Colonists always settle in uninhabited, or in thinly-

peopled countries. The very circumstance of being thinly peopled renders the supply of labour scanty, while the demand for labourers to cultivate the earth, in order to send the produce to the mother country, is great. Labourers are disposed to emigrate from a country where wages are low and provisions are dear, to one where wages are high and provisions are cheap. Land being abundant, is cheap; persons can become proprietors at a small purchase. People of small capital, who can barely provide themselves at home with those comforts which are considered essential to their class in society, are induced to emigrate to a colony where the necessaries of life may be obtained in abundance, and where there is a prospect of acquiring wealth with the improved condition of the colony.

At Carthage, the colonists were sent out by the state; and, in all cases it seems desirable that the Government of the mother country should superintend the establishment of the colony. The resources of the new country should be employed —the places fixed upon where towns and cities are to be built—and roads, and other means of communication, accurately marked out. Such arrangements ought not to be left to individual caprice. It may materially retard the development of the resources of a colony if the towns are badly situated, or if the roads are badly arranged.

It is a mistake to suppose that in planting a colony you ought to send out the poorest, the most ignorant, and the most destitute of the population. If you send out people who have been accustomed to live on buttermilk and potatoes, and to reside in the same apartments as the swine, they will labour only till they have acquired the same necessaries to which they have been accustomed at home; but if you send out people who are in comfortable circumstances—men who have been accustomed to have a kitchen and a parlour, neatly furnished—to have two or three suits of clothes, and to see their wives and their children dressed smart on a Sunday,—these men will not only improve the colony more rapidly by their superior knowledge, and by the little capital they may take with them, but they will also retain a taste

for those comforts to which they have been accustomed; and as these comforts cannot be manufactured so cheaply in the colony, they will be obtained from the mother country. The best colonists are those who are poor enough to be willing to work hard, and rich enough to have a taste for the comforts of life. The desire of obtaining these comforts will induce them to extend the cultivation of the colony, and the supplying of these comforts will promote the manufactures of the mother country, and thus create additional employment for the population at home. In these various respects we find that the establishment of colonies is a means of extending commerce.

Fourthly. Commerce is extended by the accumulation of capital.

A merchant's capital is the property he employs in carrying on his business. In proportion to the amount of his capital is the extent of the business in which he can engage. What applies to one individual, applies to many. A country where capital abounds can carry on a more extensive trade than a country which has but little capital. Capital is increased by industry and frugality. A merchant must first make a profit, and then apply a portion of that profit as a means of further production. The profit thus employed as capital again yields a profit, which is again applied as capital. Thus, capital results out of savings from profits, and the profits upon those savings. Capital is employed in the purchase of raw materials, in the erection of machinery, in the payment of wages. The more raw materials a manufacturer can purchase, the more machines he can erect, the more men he can employ, the more extensive is the business in which he can engage. The capital of a country consists in the amount of raw produce, either in the mines, the fisheries, or corn or cattle, in the manufactures, or machines for fabricating these into useful commodities, in the number of its ships, in its stock of money or goods for the payment of wages; in proportion to the amount of these is the extent of its exports, and in proportion to the extent of its exports is its ability to purchase imports,

An accumulation of capital enables an exporting country to give long credit. This is one means by which the English

merchants are said to have kept possession of the foreign markets. The merchants of other countries being comparatively poor, are obliged to sell for ready money, or, at least, at short credit. Whereas, the English merchant, from his great capital, can give extensive credit. The length of his credit is of less importance to him, provided he knows that his capital will ultimately be returned with a proportionate profit. Hence, the foreign importer of English goods may be able to sell the goods and get the money, before he is called upon to pay the English manufacturer; and, consequently, he is able to carry on a more extensive trade. So, if a manufacturer sells to a shopkeeper upon credit, the shopkeeper may sell at least some of the goods, and receive the money, by the time he has to pay the manufacturer. Thus, the shopkeeper is able to keep a larger stock of goods, and to transact more business, than though he were to pay ready money for all his purchases. The extent of credit in any country is no proof of want of capital. On the contrary, it may be a proof of the abundance of capital. It is the abundance of capital which enables a merchant to give credit, and the person to whom credit is given has usually some capital, also, which enables him to extend his credit. When we observe, by way of reproach, that such a person trades upon credit, we mean that he is accustomed to take longer credit than is usual in his trade, or that he takes credit where it is usual to pay ready money, or that he raises money by accommodation bills, or other fictitious means.

In all countries where capital has accumulated, there is a class of men who become dealers in capital. They are not themselves engaged in trade, but they furnish merchants and traders with such temporary supplies of capital as they may occasionally or periodically require. These men are styled bankers. It is their business to economise the national capital,—to increase the rapidity of its circulation—and thus to render it more productive. In a district where there is no banker, a merchant or trader must always keep by him a sum of money adequate to meet any sudden demand. But when a bank is established, he need not retain this sum. He may

trade to the full amount of his capital, and if he should have occasion for a temporary loan he may obtain it, by way of discount, from the bank. Thus the productive capital of this country is increased. The banker is a depository of capital. He is like the fly-wheel of an engine, he either receives or communicates power, as the occasion may require, and thus maintains the firmness and increases the efficiency of the machinery of commerce.

Bankers are not merely lenders of capital, they are dealers in capital. They borrow of those who wish to lend; they lend to those who wish to borrow. The borrowing of capital is effected by the system of deposits. Not merely merchants and traders, but persons out of trade, noblemen, gentlemen, farmers, and others, have usually in their possession small sums of money, which they keep by them to meet their occasional expenses. When a bank is established in their neighbourhood, they lodge these sums of money upon interest with the bankers. Individually, they may be of small amount, but, collectively, they make a considerable sum, which the banker employs in granting facilities to those who are engaged in trade and commerce. Thus, these little rivulets of capital are united, and form a powerful stream, which propels the wheels of manufactures, and sets in motion the machinery of industry.

Bankers also employ their own credit as capital. They issue notes, promising to pay the bearer a certain sum on demand. As long as the public are willing to take these notes as gold, they produce, to a certain extent, the same effects. The banker, who first makes advances to the agriculturist, the manufacturer, or the merchant, in his own notes, stimulates as much the productive powers of the country, and provides employment for as many labourers, as if, by means of the philosopher's stone, he had created an amount of gold equal to the amount of notes permanently maintained in circulation. It is this feature of our banking system that has been most frequently assailed. It has been called a system of fictitious credit—a raising the wind—a system of bubbles. Call it what you please, we will not

quarrel about names; but, by whatever name you may call it, it is a powerful instrument of production. If it be a fictitious system, its effects are not fictitious; for it leads to the feeding, the clothing, and the employing of a numerous population. If it be a raising of the wind, it is the wind of commerce, that bears to distant markets the produce of our soil, and wafts to our shores the productions of every climate. If it be a system of bubbles, they are bubbles which, like those of steam, move the mighty engines that promote a nation's greatness, and a nation's wealth.

Thus, a banker in three ways increases the productive powers of capital. First, he economizes the capital already in a state of employment. Secondly, by the system of deposits, he gives employment to capital that was previously unproductive. Thirdly, by the issue of his own notes, he virtually creates capital by the substitution of credit.

The means which a banker possesses of granting facilities to trade and commerce will be in proportion to the amount of these three sources of capital. If his own capital amounts to 100,000*l.*, and the deposits in his hands amount to 100,000*l.*, and his notes in circulation amount to 100,000*l.*, he has then at his command the sum of 300,000*l.*, with which he may discount bills for his customers. But if the public say to him, "We will take your notes no longer, give us gold," he will issue gold, but he must then reduce his discounts from 300,000*l.* to 200,000*l.* If the depositors also demanded the return of their deposits, he must reduce his discounts from 200,000*l.* to 100,000*l.* His capital will then be reduced to the original sum of 100,000*l.*—the sum raised by deposits being again rendered unproductive in the hands of the owners, and that raised by the circulation of notes being altogether annihilated.

Banking promotes the prosperity of a country, chiefly by increasing the amount and efficiency of its capital. In the history of commerce, we find no principle more firmly established than this: that as the capital of a country is increased, agriculture, manufactures, commerce, and industry will flourish;

and when capital is diminished, these will decline. The man who attempts to annihilate any portion of the capital of the country in which he dwells, is as forgetful of his own advantage as the miller who should endeavour to dry up the mountain-stream which turns the wheels of his machinery, or the farmer who should desire to intercept the sun and the showers which fertilize his fields.*

The Phœnicians are said to have been the first inventors of coin though some writers have attributed this honour to the Lydians. We have already stated an opinion that the "money current with the merchants," in the time of Abraham, consisted of bars, or pieces of silver, bearing some stamp or mark denoting the quality and the weight, and that this mark or stamp was placed on them by Phœnician merchants. It was no great transition to cut these bars into smaller pieces, and to place on them a stamp denoting their value, and the country by which they were issued. The issue of such coins would soon fall into the hands of the government, who would fix the value at which they should pass current.

There are both silver and copper coins of Tyre now extant in the British Museum. They bear the head or figure of their god Melkart, or Hercules, the same denoted in Scripture by the name of Baal, and supposed to represent the Sun. Some of the Phœnician coins bear the figure of the fish which supplied the celebrated purple. It is said that at Carthage leather money was issued by the State, and passed current. It would be interesting, and might be instructive to know under what circumstances this money was issued—by what rules the amount was regulated—and whether, in its properties and effects, it bore any resemblance to the paper money of modern times.

When capital has accumulated in any country, it gives rise to the trade or business of money-lending. Other persons, besides bankers, who have money, make a profit, not by going into trade themselves, but by lending it to those

* At the time this Lecture was delivered (March, 1833), there was a run for gold upon all the banks in the south of Ireland.

who are in trade. The Carthaginians are said to have introduced one branch of this business—that of lending money on bottomry; that is, upon the security of shipping. A person who had a ship, and wanted money to purchase a cargo, might borrow from one of those money-lenders, upon the security of the bottom of the ship; when the ship returned the money was repaid. The lender had no interest in the cargo; but the ship was pledged to him whether the adventure were successful or not. This kind of business is carried on in the present day. A ship may be mortgaged like an estate, and the sum advanced is entered on the registry.

Capital is rendered more productive by the formation of partnerships. It would often be very convenient if a merchant could be in two places at the same time. But this cannot be done. If, however, there are two or three partners in a firm, these partners may be in distant places, and thus the interests of the whole may be properly attended to. By dividing their business into distinct branches, and each partner superintending a branch, the business may flourish as much as if the establishment belonged to one individual, who had the convenient attribute of ubiquity. One partner may superintend the town department—the other, the country; one the manufacturing—the other, the selling branch; one the books—the other, the warehouse; and by this division of labour, each branch of the business will have the advantage of being constantly under the superintendence of a principal of the firm. Another advantage is, that by mutual discussion upon their affairs, the concern will be conducted with more discretion. The ignorance of one may be supplied by the knowledge of the other; the speculative disposition of one may be restrained by the phlegmatic disposition of the other; the carelessness of one may be counteracted by the prudence of the other.

But the great advantage arising from partnerships is, that capital accumulates faster: there can be a greater division of labour in a large establishment; there will be a less proportionate expense; the firm will be able to gain a greater

amount of credit; and more confidence will be placed in their honour and integrity. It is very rare that a dishonest failure is made by a firm.

A Joint Stock Company is a partnership with many partners. The partners being so numerous, the management is necessarily intrusted to a few of them, who are styled directors. Such companies are very useful, and even necessary, in those operations which require a larger amount of capital than can be raised by an individual capitalist:—such as the peopling of a new colony, the supplying of a town with water or gas; or which are so speculative that no individual would like to take the whole risk on himself, such as mining; or which, to be carried on successfully, require a large share of public confidence, such as fire and life insurance, and banking. In these cases, and, perhaps, in a few others, joint-stock companies cannot be supplanted by individual competition. But, in the production or sale of articles destined for general consumption, no public company can stand a contest against individual enterprise. The price at which any article can be sold must be regulated by the cost of production. Experience proves, that commodities cannot be produced by a company at so low a cost as they can be produced by individuals; hence the individual will always be able to undersell the company.

Thus, then, we are taught, by the history of Tyre and Carthage, that commerce is extended by the means of maritime power—the establishment of manufactures—the planting of colonies—and the accumulation of capital. We shall now consider the commercial character of the Carthaginians.

1. The Carthaginians were remarkable for a love of justice. It was a maxim with them, that if any citizen was injured, the community were bound to see it redressed.

I believe it will be found to accord with historical truth, that the more nations are commercial, the more honest they are in their dealings. Half-civilized nations, who have no idea of commerce, are proverbial for their dissimulation, treachery, and fraud. But when the individuals of any country have dealings with each other in trade, they ne-

cessarily acquire correct ideas of the principles of equity and the rights of property; and the public voice condemns false balances and deceitful weights—false representations and exorbitant prices. The public voice proclaims that you violate justice when you give to your labourers less wages than their due; when you take advantage of the inexperience or inadvertence of your customers; when your goods are of an inferior quality, or when you do not abide by your agreement. You also violate justice when you engage in speculations, the profits of which, if successful, will belong to yourself; but the losses, if unsuccessful, will fall upon your creditors. You violate justice when you provide comforts for your family, or use hospitality towards your friends, or bestow charity on the poor at other people's expense. A virtue that cannot be exercised, but by a violation of justice, is no longer a virtue.

It is a great mistake to suppose that rogues are generally clever men. It is very easy for any man who is supposed to be honest to perpetrate one act of successful villany by abusing the confidence placed in him; but as soon as his character is known, he is successful no longer, and the cleverness he has manifested is found to resemble that of the man who ripped up the goose which laid the golden eggs. His honesty would have supported him for life; but one act of villany has reduced him for ever to poverty and infamy. Hence, you will find that rogues are generally poor. The number of rogues who are even successful is very few as compared with the number of honest men; and success in one instance prevents success in every subsequent enterprise. In the Book of Proverbs—a book which, apart from its sacred character, contains the best instructions for obtaining success in life—the rogue is always styled a fool.

But if a man is a fool to expect to attain wealth by dishonest means, he is a still greater fool if he expects that wealth so acquired will afford him any enjoyment.—Enjoyment did I say? Is it possible that, in such a case, any man can expect enjoyment? What! enjoyment for you—you who have obtained wealth by falsehood—by deception—

by extortion—by oppression—you expect enjoyment? Listen—listen to the hearty denunciations of all honest men; to the awful imprecations of those you have injured; to the reproaches of your family, whose name you have dishonoured; to the accusations of that conscience whose voice you have stifled, and to the wrathful thunder of that heaven whose laws you have outraged! Listen to these—these are the *enjoyments* that will attend your ill-gotten wealth:—"He that getteth riches and not by right, shall leave them in the midst of his days: and at his end shall be a fool."

And here I would advise you to have no dealings with a man who is known to be a rogue, even though he should offer a bargain that may, in that instance, be for your advantage to accept. To avoid him is your duty, on the ground of morality; but it is, moreover, your interest in a pecuniary point of view; for, depend upon it, although he may let you get money by him at first, he will contrive to cheat you in the end. An additional reason is, that your own reputation, and even your moral sensibilities, may be endangered by the contact. If you get money by a rogue, there is a danger that you will feel disposed to apologize for his rogueries; and, when you have once become an apologist for roguery, you will probably, on the first temptation, become a rogue yourself.

2. The Carthaginians had a high regard for wealth.

The desire of wealth is either a virtue or a vice, according to the motives from which it proceeds. When a man desires wealth, to provide against the contingencies of life and the infirmities of age—to settle his family creditably in the world—to increase his power of serving his friends or his country—to enable him to be more charitable to the poor, or, to extend the influence of religion—his desire is a virtue, and he may reasonably expect, that with prudence, honesty, and industry, his exertions will ultimately be successful. It is much to be regretted that the declamations of some moralists, and the pictures of some poets, have countenanced the sentiment, that wealth is unfriendly to virtue or to happiness; that these are found only in a cottage; and that,

as wealth increases, men depart from simplicity and rectitude. 'Tis perfectly true, that virtuous poverty is always deserving of respect, and that wealth, associated with vice, is always to be despised; but it is not correct that poverty, more than wealth, is friendly to virtue. 'Tis not correct that the possession of wealth, honestly acquired, has any tendency either to enervate the intellect, to corrupt the morals, or to impair the happiness of man. The fact is the reverse. 'Tis poverty which is the source of crime—'tis poverty which is the great barrier to the acquisition of knowledge—'tis poverty which is the great source of human woe. If you wish to increase your knowledge, increase your wealth: you will then have more leisure to study, and be better able to purchase the means of instruction. If you wish to increase your virtue, increase your wealth: you will then have a higher character to support, and fewer and less powerful temptations to act dishonourably and disreputably. If you wish to increase your happiness, increase your wealth: you will then have more numerous sources of pleasure, and, above all, you will be able to indulge in the luxury of doing good. Away with the notion that wealth is an evil. If wealth be an evil, industry is a vice; for the tendency of industry is to produce wealth. If wealth be an evil, commerce should be abandoned; for the object of commerce is to acquire wealth. If wealth be an evil, those efforts which are made by benevolence or patriotism, to improve the condition of the poor, are deserving, not of support, but of execration. But wealth is not an evil. However much the doctrine may have been countenanced by *pseudo* moralists or dreaming poets, it has never been generally acted upon, for it is one opposed to the common sense of mankind. Both to individuals and to nations wealth is a blessing. It is only when nations become wealthy that the population are well fed and well clothed, and reside in roomy habitations well furnished. It is only when nations become wealthy that the cities and towns have wide streets, well formed for carriages and for foot passengers, and apparatus for conveying the water to every private habitation, and for supplying light in the

streets at night. It is only when nations become wealthy that famines are less frequent, epidemic and contagious disorders less fatal, and institutions are formed for relieving the distresses and promoting the education of the poor. It is only when nations have become wealthy that men have leisure for study—that literature flourishes—that science is explored—that mechanical inventions are discovered—and that the fine arts are patronized and encouraged:—all these are the effects of wealth.

3. The desire of wealth was associated with habits of prudence and economy.

The only way by which capital can increase is by saving. If you spend as much as you get you will never be richer than you are. 'Tis not what a man gets, but what he saves, that constitutes his wealth. Go, learn the first two rules of arithmetic—learn addition and subtraction. Add to your present capital any amount you please—subtract the sum which you add, and tell me if the last amount will not be the same as the first. Every merchant should, in every year of his life, make some addition to his capital. You say you get but little: never mind; spend less than that little, and then next year you will get more, for you will have the profit upon the sum you save. There is no royal road to wealth any more than to geometry. The man who goes on spending all he gets, and expects that by some lucky hit he shall be raised to wealth, will most likely sink into poverty,—for, in case of adverse fortune, he has then no resource; whereas, by economy, he may lay by a stock that may serve as a provision in case of adversity. You may say that the times are bad—the seasons are bad—the laws are bad. Be it so; but, were the case reversed, it would make no difference to you. Look at home; you spend more than you get: how then can you be otherwise than poor? How many a respectable family have fallen from a high station, which they worthily and honourably filled, merely because neither the gentleman nor the lady had been familiar with the first four rules of arithmetic. Had they known how to check the accounts of their agents, their tradesmen, and their servants;

had they known how to compare their receipts with their expenditure, and to see which preponderates, all their difficulties might have been avoided. A very small acquaintance with the principles of commerce is sufficient to teach, that if a man spends every year more than he receives, he will necessarily, fall into poverty.

4. It is said that the Carthaginians allowed no man to hold office in the state unless he was more or less wealthy. It will be remembered that Carthage was a republic, and had no hereditary aristocracy. Hence, wealth formed the chief distinction. It might, therefore, be a good rule, that those who had most influence in the state should possess the most political power: that, "to have a stake in the hedge," should be deemed a necessary qualification for those who were to govern the state. When a man of wealth accepts an office in the state, his individual property gives additional respectability to his official station.

Rank, and talents, and eloquence, and learning, and moral worth, all receive respect; but, unconnected with property, they have much less influence in commanding the services of other men. These may attract admiration, but it is property that gives power. Detached from property, their influence is as evanescent as the fragrance of flowers detached from the soil. It may be true, the soil has little that claims our respect, but still the virtues which the flowers extract from the soil give and maintain their fragrance and their strength. Thus, the clod of wealth, though in itself it adds nothing to individual character, yet, having its influences purified and varied by the channels through which they pass, gives additional beauty and energy to both the public and the private virtues; it imparts firmness to patriotism; it gives a lovelier hue to benevolence, and a more extensive charm to religion. The example of a man of property has a wider influence, and, when exercised in the path of a patriot, a philanthropist, and a Christian, is more likely to be followed.

One advantage of rendering wealth the road to honour may have been that individuals would be more anxious to acquire wealth, and also that those who had acquired honours

would not suffer their own estate to fall into decay, lest they should have again to abdicate their official stations. It is a good maxim, and one likely to have been current in a commercial state, that if a man does not take care of his own affairs, he is not likely to attend well to those of other people. They "who sit in high places" ought to be noble, and generous, and magnanimous; but no man ought to be generous beyond his means. The man who has squandered his property in gratifying a vain ostentation, falsely called hospitality, has grasped at the shadow but lost the substance. From this cause many who are born rich, die poor. He who had thus squandered away his own property, would not, at Carthage, have been intrusted with the treasures of the state.

5. The Carthaginians looked upon commerce with respect. No man will excel in his profession if he thinks himself above it; and commerce will never flourish in any country where commerce is not respected. Commerce flourished in England, because there a merchant was respected, and was thought worthy of the highest honour his country could bestow. Commerce never flourished in France, because there it was despised; and the character of *un riche bourgeois*—a rich citizen—was the character which their dramatic writers were fond of introducing as the subject of ridicule. Commerce will never flourish in a country where young men, whose fathers are barely able to maintain a genteel appearance, think it beneath their rank to enter a counting-house. Commerce will never flourish in a country where property acquired by industry is considered less deserving of respect than property acquired by inheritance. Commerce will never flourish in a country where men in business, instead of bringing up their sons to the same business, think it more respectable to send them to professions. Commerce will never flourish in a country where men, as soon as they get a few thousand pounds by trade, are anxious to get out of trade, and to mix with the society of the fashionable world. What is it that gives respectability? Is it knowledge?—What profession requires so much, and such varied know-

ledge, as that of a merchant? Is it utility to the state?—What order of men tend more to increase the wealth and happiness of the state than that of merchants? Is it moral character?—To whom is moral character so essential as to a merchant? Without this he is despised.

It is much to be regretted that people who have realized a little money by trade should retire and take out their capital, and thus reduce the commercial capital of the country. What reason can you assign for this? You say you are independent: go on, get wealthy. You say you are wealthy: go and get more wealth. The more wealth you get, the more you serve your country, and the greater power you have of doing good to others. You say you are getting old: take a young partner; do you find capital and knowledge, and let him find labour and activity. You say you have toiled long enough; you wish to retire and enjoy yourself. Retirement will be no enjoyment to you: to a man of your active habits solitude and idleness will have no charms. The most effectual means you can adopt to make yourself wretched, and to shorten your days, will be to place yourself in a situation where you will have nothing to do. But you say, you think it will be more respectable to be out of business—to have an establishment like a nobleman—and to introduce your sons and daughters into fashionable society. Oh, if that is the reason, by all means go: if you have become so high that you look down upon your business, the sooner you leave it the better. I have now nothing more to say to you.

LECTURE IV.

THE COMMERCE OF ANCIENT ROME.

Origin of Agriculture. Characteristics of an Agricultural and a Commercial State of Society. Agriculture of the Romans—Influence of Agriculture on Commerce. Wars of the Romans—Influence of War upon Commerce. Conquests of the Romans—Influence of extended Empire upon Commerce. Slavery of the Romans—Influence of Domestic Slavery upon Ancient Commerce. Roman Roads—Transmission of Letters. Roman Bankers—Money. Marine Insurance—Assurance of Lives. Commercial Character of the Romans.

THERE is no branch of ancient history with which we are so intimately acquainted as that of Rome, nor is there any which is more closely associated with the ideas and habits of modern times. The language of Rome enters largely into many of the languages of modern Europe, and it is the language associated with the ideas of our earliest youth. From Rome we have derived several of the principles of our laws, and the knowledge of several branches of literature and of science.

Rome, as well as most ancient nations, commenced with a very small territory, and a small population. In tracing the early history of almost every nation, we shall find that it originally consisted of a number of small tribes or clans, wholly independent of each other. The heads of these tribes were the children or descendants of the chiefs of some illustrious family. When a younger son wished to emigrate, he took with him such of his father's retainers as were willing to accompany him, and either took possession of some inhabited district or dispossessed those who were previously its occupiers. In this way, Rome was founded by Romulus, about

700 years before the Christian era. The people of Rome were rude and uncivilized, possessing little knowledge of the arts of social life, and knowing none of its luxuries. But, though rude, they were not barbarians. They had a fixed place of residence—they understood the rights of private property—they had a settled form of government—and they understood the art of cultivating the earth. They devoted themselves to agriculture; and in the interval between seed time and harvest, they amused themselves by making war with the petty tribes by whom they were surrounded. Though generally successful in their contests, they did not rapidly acquire the dominion they ultimately obtained. At the time of Alexander the Great, the territory of Rome did not extend much beyond the present limits of the Ecclesiastical States.

I shall consider Rome in three points of view:—

First, As an agricultural tribe.

Secondly, As a warlike nation.

Thirdly, As an extended empire.

These three points of view will correspond pretty nearly with the three periods of its kingly, republican, and imperial form of government; and will give us the opportunity of tracing the influence of agriculture, war, and extended empire upon the interests of commerce.

First. Let us consider the ancient Romans as an agricultural tribe, and trace the influence of agriculture upon commerce.

We find that soon after the creation of the world, tillage and pasturage were practised. Abel was a keeper of sheep, and Cain was a tiller of the ground. Immediately after the Deluge, Noah planted a vineyard,—a circumstance which shows that this art was known to the antediluvian world, and was communicated by Noah to his successors. Egypt and Babylon, founded by his immediate offspring, became remarkable for their agriculture. The tribes which separated from the rest of mankind, and lost their knowledge of the arts of civilized life, neglected agriculture; but when they became acquainted with settlers from foreign countries, the first art

they learned was the art of cultivating the earth. Others became enamoured of a shepherd's life, and devoted themselves to pasturage; but when the earth became more densely peopled, they were under the necessity of occupying a settled habitation, and of attending to the cultivation of the soil. The ancient patriarchs were shepherds, who drove their flocks to wherever they could find pasture and water. A pastoral state is, in some degree, a commercial state, as the shepherds must purchase those commodities which their own mode of life does not produce.

The ancient Romans were devoted to agriculture, and their most illustrious commanders were sometimes called from the plough. The senators commonly resided in the country, and cultivated the ground with their own hands; and the noblest families derived their surnames from cultivating particular kinds of grain. To be a good husbandman was accounted the highest praise; and whoever neglected his ground, or cultivated it improperly, was liable to the animadversions of the Censors. At first no citizen had more ground than he could cultivate himself: Romulus allotted to each only two acres. After the expulsion of the kings, seven acres were granted to each citizen; and this continued for a long time to be the usual portion assigned to them in the division of conquered lands.

An agricultural population, being employed in the open air, necessarily enjoys, in a high degree, strong physical powers. They have strength of body, and, usually, strength or firmness of mind,—a capacity to endure labour and fatigue. A consciousness of strength produces courage and frankness of behaviour. In our own time, recruits for the army, raised in agricultural districts, are always found superior to those raised in towns and cities.

An agricultural population, being scattered over a great extent of country, have not the same means of intercourse which are to be found in commercial towns. From this circumstance they have less general information, less artificial courtesy of manners, and a less acquaintance with what is called the world. There is, also, usually less suspicion, and a

less acquaintance with the luxuries and the vices of mankind; they are more distinguished for the domestic virtues, and have a less taste for general associations.

An agricultural population is necessarily in a state of gradation of rank; the landlord is superior to the farmer, the farmer is superior to the labourer, and their different ranks are like so many castes, preserved for ages in the same families. Hence, an agricultural population is usually characterised by a submission to authority, an attachment to ancient families and to ancient customs, and an aversion to change.

An agricultural population depends for its success upon the seasons, over which man has no control. From this arises a consciousness of their dependence upon a superior power. We usually find that an agricultural population is attentive to the observances of religion.

All these observations were illustrated in the history of the earlier Romans.

They were strong, athletic men, possessed of undaunted courage, and they improved their strength and their courage by severe discipline and constant practice. They were remarkable for the simplicity of their manners. Some of their greatest men came from the plough to act as the temporary governors of the nation; and when the occasion for their services had ceased, again returned to labour on their farms. They were remarkable for the practice of the domestic virtues, for their conjugal fidelity, for their attention to the education of their children, and for the discipline of their households. They were remarkable for their subordination to the constituted authorities. Even that invidious distinction of patrician and plebeian was continued for several centuries. A Roman consul possessed more power during the year he was in office than any king in modern Europe. Though they sometimes resisted their governors, it was usually for the redress of some practical grievance,—not with a view of depriving them of power. They were remarkable for their attention to the worship of the immortal gods. They held their oaths most sacred. Any omen, which

could be considered as an indication of the displeasure of a deity, filled them with dismay. Even the gods of the countries they conquered were adopted as objects of their worship, and placed in Rome among the original deities.

Now let us trace the influence of agriculture on commerce.

An agricultural country may, without manufactures, carry on an extensive commerce. If the country yields more food than is necessary for the consumption of the inhabitants, that superabundant portion may be exported, in exchange for the manufactured commodities of other nations; but, as the whole population of such a country cannot be employed in cultivating the soil, many persons will be idle. This spirit of idleness will affect those who are engaged in productive industry, and hence the soil itself will not be fully cultivated. There will therefore be great poverty, unless the unemployed hands emigrate to other countries, where manufactures are carried on, or where there are waste lands to cultivate.

Agriculture also supplies the materials for establishing manufactures. If a country produces abundance of wool, it may have a woollen manufactory; if cattle, it may make articles of leather or of horn; if timber, it may construct ships and barges; if it produces corn, it may make flour, beer, and spirits. The raw materials of most of our manufactures are derived from agriculture.

The extension of agriculture has the effect of lowering the wages of those who are employed in manufactures and commerce. Improvements in agriculture increase the supply of food, and hence lower its price. A reduction in the price of food causes a reduction in the price of labour, and the reduction of wages stimulates manufactures, either by reducing the price of the commodity to the consumers, or by increasing the profit of the manufacturer. In those several ways does agriculture possess an influence on commerce.

We thus see that commerce promotes agriculture, and agriculture promotes commerce. We do wrong when we consider the commercial interests as opposed to the agricultural interests. They both harmonize—they are two wheels

of the same machine; and, although they may seem to move in opposite directions, yet each, in its own way, promotes the public wealth, and any obstruction to the movement of one would soon retard the motion of the other.

Secondly. Let us consider the Romans as a warlike nation, and trace the influence of war upon commerce.

The Romans made war their principal concern. By constant discipline they acquired expertness, and by almost constant practice they acquired experience. The Roman citizens formed a disciplined standing army, while their opponents were generally a mere militia, hastily formed to resist the invader. They were at all times anxious to improve their military skill, and borrowed, even from their enemies, all their improvements in arms. Their courage in battle was not less conspicuous than their fortitude under defeat. They never made peace when defeated. Their social institutions were friendly to their military aggrandizement. As a Roman consul remained in office but one year, he was anxious to distinguish his consulate by some remarkable event, and nothing could distinguish him so much as a successful war. The prudent maxims of their government were also additional causes of their success. When they conquered a country they incorporated it with their own. They gave the chief men the privilege of Roman citizens, and suffered the people to govern themselves according to their own laws, reserving to themselves the power of making new regulations, and of inflicting capital punishments. In making war with a distant nation, they always secured first the assistance of some neighbouring people. When two nations quarrelled, the Romans assisted the weaker nation, and, in cases of civil war, they took the side of the weaker party. The Romans assisted their allies to conquer their opponents; and, ultimately, both the belligerents became subject to Rome. By a constant adherence to this system, the Roman power became gradually extended.

To maintain a martial spirit among the people, a triumph was usually decreed to the successful general.

Nothing could be more calculated to captivate the

imagination than a Roman triumph. A splendid arch was erected, beneath which the procession was to pass; the streets were strewed with flowers, whose fragrance perfumed the air; the citizens thronged to meet with acclamations the returning warrior; before him were carried the spoils which he had taken from the vanquished foe; then followed the most illustrious captives, who had been compelled to submit to the prowess of his arms; the hero himself, clothed in purple, and crowned with laurel, then followed in an open chariot. Patriotism shouted his praises—beauty saluted him with her sweetest smiles—music poured forth her most melodious sounds—and even religion placed on her altar more costly offerings, and clouds of incense ascended from her temples.

But now let us change the scene, and view the country he has conquered. The fields lie waste for want of labourers; her manhood and her youth have fallen on the field of battle; her old men, who were placed to defend the walls of her cities, were slain in the assault; her princes and her heroes who have escaped the sword are loaded with chains, and carried as slaves into a foreign land. The statues and the pictures, and the ornaments of her palaces and her temples, are taken to swell the spoils of the conqueror. The cities are burnt, and now, amid the smouldering ruins, nothing is seen but desolate females, bewailing the loss of those they loved, and half-famished children asking why they weep.

We wait not here to consider the humanity or the policy of war. Our object is to trace its influence upon commerce.

The object of war and of commerce is the same,—that is, to obtain possession of what we do not possess. But though the object is the same, the means are different. War exclaims—"See! the people of yonder country have comforts and luxuries which our country does not produce; we are stronger than they, let us go and kill them, and take their country for ourselves." "No!" says commerce, "while their country produces commodities which ours does not, our country produces commodities which theirs does not; let us then take some of the commodities of which we have a greater

abundance than we need, and offer them in exchange for those commodities we wish to acquire. By this course we shall avoid the guilt of a quarrel, and the danger of a defeat; we shall obtain an ample supply of all the enjoyments we need; and we shall promote the happiness of other nations as well as our own." Thus, by means of commerce, we can obtain a large supply of all the productions that are to be found in the whole world as effectually as though we had conquered all its provinces with the sword, and compelled all its inhabitants to toil for our enjoyment. But mankind have, unfortunately, preferred war to commerce; and the certain advantages that might have been derived from trade have been sacrificed to the hazardous speculations of war.

While, however, we contend that the spirit of war is opposed to the spirit of commerce, we must not be understood to mean that commercial nations are on that account the less capable of carrying on war. Their indisposition to war arises not from want of courage, but from a peaceable disposition, and a feeling of justice. They are not led away by a love of glory or a desire for revenge. They take a business-like view of the question; they examine the debtor and the creditor side of the account, and calculate beforehand what they shall gain by fighting. But, when once compelled to draw the sword, commercial nations are foes not to be despised. Look at ancient Tyre, that for thirteen years resisted the power of Babylon, led on by Nebuchadnezzar; at new Tyre—a town built on a rock—that for seven months arrested the progress of Alexander the Great; at Carthage, that for centuries contended with the armies of martial Rome; and come to modern history, and trace the wars of Venice and Genoa, of Holland, and of England, and tell me if commercial nations have shown themselves deficient in that valour and enterprise which are the foundations of successful war. It is remarkable that the commercial city of Corinth supplied excellent military commanders, insomuch that the other states of Greece preferred Corinthian generals to natives of their own states. May we not infer from this that the commercial virtues of foresight, calculation, diligence, arrange-

ment, and perseverance, united to a knowledge of military tactics, laid the foundation of their success?

But though commercial nations have been sometimes compelled to engage in war, and have generally waged it successfully, yet war is injurious to commerce.

War injures commerce by consuming, unproductively, a portion of the produce of the land and labour of the community. That capital which is employed in providing the material for war, might be employed in promoting trade and commerce. The labour and capital which are employed in constructing fortifications, might be employed in building manufactories, or warehouses, or harbours, or bridges, or commodious houses for the people to inhabit. What is consumed in cannons and muskets might be employed in making railroads; the food and clothing which are given to soldiers might be given to husbandmen, or to manufacturers; and those men who are employed every day at drill, or in fight, might be employed in cultivating the soil, or in the production of valuable articles, or in the management of ships. A nation resembles an individual. If I have 600 men at work on my land, I have a profit on the labour of 600 men; but if I am obliged to employ 200 of these men as soldiers to defend the remaining 400, then I have a profit only on the labour of 400 men, and out of that profit I must pay the wages of the 200, whose labour is wholly unproductive. In this way, war necessarily retards the accumulation of national capital.

War is also injurious to commerce by rendering the people less able to purchase foreign commodities. As a certain quantity of national capital is abstracted to carry on the war, less remains in the hands of the people, and, consequently, their means of enjoyment are diminished. A man who has to pay an increased amount of taxes has less money to expend in food and clothing for his family; and there is consequently a less demand for the productions of trade.

War is also injurious to commerce by the obstructions given to the transport of commercial commodities. Nations who are at war cease to trade with each other; hence there is a loss of all the advantages they might acquire by their trade.

The trade with neutral nations is also obstructed. The ships must be convoyed—the rate of insurance is increased—the price of the commodity is raised to the consumers to meet these increased charges—the increased price diminishes the consumption, and a less quantity is produced.

On the other hand, peace is friendly to trade. The sailors who were on board ships of war, are now on board merchant ships; the soldiers are employed at the plough, or at the loom; the capital employed in providing the material of war is employed in trade and commerce; taxes upon industry are diminished; and, above all, the mental power and energy which was employed in devising means of destruction, are now engaged in cultivating the arts and sciences. How much more usefully to the community are those naval officers employed who are inventing life-boats, constructing new lamps for lighthouses, or in attempting to discover the North Pole, than though they had been called to expend the blood and treasure of the country in even the most honourable or the most successful war?

Thirdly. Let us consider Rome as an extended empire, and take a view of the influence of extended empire upon the interests of commerce.

The conquests of the Romans, however achieved, were ultimately beneficial to the nations they conquered. The nations whom they conquered they civilized; they introduced the arts and sciences among the people; they established roads and constructed bridges; they built cities and aqueducts in all the conquered countries; they extended and improved the cultivation of the soil. This they would do for their own advantage, as the tax imposed on a conquered country was usually one-tenth, or sometimes one-twentieth, of the produce. One great advantage of the Roman conquest was the diminution of war. Previous to their conquest, Greece, Italy, Spain, Gaul, and Britain,—the most civilized and the most barbarous nations,—were each divided into a number of small independent states, which were perpetually at war with each other; but, when all these states were brought under the Roman power, their domestic and international contests were

necessarily at an end. Though Rome was a despotic, she was not a tyrannical mistress. She delivered the people of Asia from the tyranny of their monarchs, and the people of the West from that of the Druids. Sometimes independent nations petitioned to be placed under the Roman government. The mildness of the Roman authority is obvious from the very few insurrections that occurred among the conquered countries: except those in Spain and Britain, fomented by the Druids, there were none deserving of attention. The Roman army consisted of fewer than half a million of men, and these were employed on the frontiers, to defend the empire against the incursions of barbarians; and, when the Roman empire fell, it fell not by an insurrection from within, but by a power from without. So firmly was it fixed in the affections and the habits of the people, that even the vices and follies of the emperors could not destroy its greatness, until the barbarian came and plucked it up by the roots.

The Romans kept possession of Britain, 366 years; of Spain, 785 years; of Gaul, 425 years. The length of time the Romans kept possession of these countries shows that the people were happy under their government.

It is the opinion of some writers that Europe was more populous, and better cultivated, in the time of the Romans than it is at the present day. In this comparison, however, we must leave out Germany and all the northern nations, as these were never subdued by the Roman arms; but Italy is said to have had 1,197 cities—Gaul, 1,200—Spain, 360—Africa, 300—Asia, 500—and the cities of Antioch and Alexandria were almost rivals of Rome.

In the time of Augustus Cæsar the boundaries of the empire were, on the west, the Atlantic Ocean; on the north, the Rhine and the Danube; on the east, the Euphrates; and on the south, the deserts of Arabia and Africa. To these were afterwards added the conquests of Britain and Dacia. Trajan subsequently conquered the Parthians; but the conquests were relinquished by his successor, Hadrian. Thus, the Roman empire included, in Europe, Britain, Spain, Gaul comprising Belgium, France, part of Germany and Switzer-

land, Italy, Greece, and the islands in the Mediterranean Sea; in Asia, it included all Asia Minor, Phœnicia, Palestine, and Syria; in Africa, it included Egypt, and all the coast from Egypt to the Straits of Cadiz,—a greater extent of country than was ever before included under one government, being about 3,000 miles long and 2,000 miles broad. Let us now trace the effects of this extended empire upon commerce:—

The extended empire of Rome was beneficial to commerce by increasing the demand for luxuries.

In an extended empire the standard of wealth is higher, and there is a greater number of wealthy men. We read, that among the Romans there were men whose wealth far surpassed that of private individuals in modern times. The possession of wealth furnished the means of obtaining those enjoyments which are usually distinguished by the name of luxuries.

In the early periods of the Roman history, Italy produced nothing that could be desired by other nations. Agriculture furnished the Romans with all the necessaries of life, and they had no taste for its luxuries. But, after they became wealthy by conquest, they became desirous of the comforts which wealth can supply. Their houses, their dress, their food, their furniture, and their equipage, were all of a more costly kind. Italy was converted into gardens, so that even corn, the necessary of life, was imported from the provinces. The Romans purchased these commodities, not by giving agricultural or manufactured produce in return, as was the case with Carthage, but with the money obtained from the provinces themselves. The revenues of the republic were spent in Rome. The wealthy men in Rome had extensive estates in the provinces. The money sent to Rome as tribute, or as rent, was returned to the provinces as the purchase of their produce. Rome was supplied with corn chiefly from Sicily and Egypt; from the barbarians of the North, she obtained amber; from Malta, she obtained fine cloths; from the East Indies, she obtained silks and spices and precious stones; from her various provinces, she obtained the produce of their

mines, their soil, their climate, or their industry. Thus, the trade with Rome was altogether a trade of imports. She received everything; she exported nothing,—nothing but money, which she obtained at first from the provinces themselves. A large portion of the imports of Rome consisted, probably, of raw produce, for all the great men had large establishments of slaves, who understood the art of manufacturing most of the articles necessary for ordinary use. The more elegant and costly articles, for the use of the wealthy, were imported from those provincial towns that were distinguished for these productions.

We shall confine our details of Roman luxury to that of the table.

The luxury of the table commenced about the period of the battle of Actium, and continued till the reign of Galba. Their delicacies consisted of peacocks, cranes of Malta, nightingales, venison, and wild and tame fowls; they were also fond of fish. The reigning taste was for a profusion of provisions; whole wild boars were served up, filled with various small animals and birds of different kinds. This dish was called the Trojan Horse, in allusion to the horse filled with soldiers. Fowls and game of all sorts were served up in pyramids, piled up in dishes as broad as moderate tables. Mark Antony provided eight boars for twelve guests. Caligula served up to his guests pearls of great value, dissolved in vinegar. Lucullus had a particular name for each apartment, and a certain scale of expense attached to each. Cicero and Pompey agreed to take supper with him, provided he would not order his servants to prepare anything extraordinary. He directed the servants to prepare the supper in the room Apollo. His friends were surprised at the magnificence of the entertainment. He then informed them, that when he mentioned the name of the room, his servants knew the scale of expense. Whenever he supped in the room Apollo, the supper always cost 1,250*l.* He was equally sumptuous in his dress. A Roman Prætor, who was to give games to the public, requesting to borrow one hundred purple robes for the actors, Lucullus replied, that he could lend him two hundred

if he wanted them. The Roman furniture in their houses corresponded with their profuseness in other respects. Pliny states, that in his time more money was often given for a table than the amount of all the treasures found in Carthage when it was conquered by the Romans.

The extended empire of Rome was also beneficial to commerce, by making her the centre of the trade of some of her colonies.

All capital cities acquire a traffic of this kind. There is generally a facility of communication between the capital and the provinces, while the direct communication between province and province may be more difficult. In this case each province will send its productions to the capital, which will become the general market for the productions of all the provinces. The capital, too, being the place of general resort, a greater number of purchasers are there likely to be found. Thus, in London, you may obtain the choicest productions of Belfast, Leeds, Manchester, Birmingham, Sheffield, and Norwich. Thus, at Athens, you might have obtained the products of all the states of Greece. And thus, in ancient Rome, all the articles of luxury that were produced in any part of her extended empire, might be obtained of the choicest quality and in the greatest abundance.

Although the city of Rome produced nothing to give in exchange for her imports, yet she must thus have had considerable traffic from being the centre of communication between her several provinces. The inhabitants of Gaul or Spain would purchase in Rome the produce of Greece or Egypt, or of India, while the inhabitants of Greece, of Asia, and of Egypt, would buy in Rome the productions of the western provinces. As there was a direct communication between each province and Rome, the inhabitants of the different provinces would find it more convenient to exchange their superabundant productions through the intervention of Roman merchants, than to trade direct with each other. Every large city which is situated between two districts which yield different productions, has a trade of this kind: and it is precisely the kind of trade which is carried on by every sea-

port town. Rome was not a seaport; yet, as she was the centre of attraction and of communication of all her provinces, she became their general market, and thus acquired a trade somewhat similar to that of Tyre and Alexandria. The difference was, that Rome was not a seaport, and did not herself produce for exportation any kind of manufactures.

The extended empire of Rome was further useful to commerce by facilitating the direct trade between those countries which were under her government.

Every country possesses some physical advantages, in consequence of which the outlay of labour and capital will produce a larger quantity of particular commodities than could be produced in other countries. The climate of one country is friendly to the production of silk and wine; another yields corn and cattle; a third has mines of coal, and copper, and iron; another has extensive forests of timber. Now, it is for the general interests that each country should produce those commodities for which it has a natural advantage, and exchange it for the superabundant productions of other countries. If the inhabitants of any country say, "We will have no trade—we will produce all these commodities from our own soil," it will be found that those people will produce very badly some commodities which they might otherwise have had in perfection, and will have but a scanty supply of some comforts which they might otherwise have had in abundance; while, at the same time, it will have no market for its own surplus productions.

When each country has been an independent state, conduct like this has, more or less, been often adopted with reference to particular commodities, both in ancient and in modern times. Sometimes nations have prohibited the importation of the productions of other countries, in order to encourage the growth of similar productions at home. Or they have laid on a certain duty or tax, in order to enable the home production to come into competition with the foreign. On the other hand, nations have sometimes prohibited the exportation of commodities, lest enough should not remain for home consumption, or lest other nations should obtain some

advantage from their possession. Latterly, nations have been more disposed to lay prohibitions on imports than on exports.

But when these rival countries become united under one government, and form one nation, such restrictions do not exist. What was formerly a foreign trade, now becomes a domestic trade. Each nation employs its capital and labour in the productions of those commodities which its physical or acquired advantages enable it to produce with the least cost and in the greatest perfection; and a free interchange takes place between them, uninterrupted by war, or national jealousy, or fiscal regulations. It is clearly not for the interests of commerce that the family of mankind should be subdivided into a great number of small independent states. It is the interest of commerce that small nations or states should unite and form large ones. If all Germany formed one kingdom, there would be more trade between the respective divisions. If all Italy formed one state, the internal trade would be increased; and if France and Italy, and Spain and Portugal and England, were united under one government, as they were in the days of the Romans, the commerce between these countries would be unrestricted, and, consequently, more extensive. Extended empire then, in these various ways, is friendly to commerce.

Having considered the Romans as an agricultural tribe, a warlike nation, and an extensive empire, I shall now take a view of those institutions which have a connection with commerce. These are—

First. The institution of domestic slavery.

Secondly. The institutions for the transmission of letters.

Thirdly. Institutions for buying and selling.

Fourthly. The institutions for insuring property.

I. The institution of domestic slavery:—The following accounts are given us respecting the domestic slavery of the Romans:—

Men became slaves among the Romans by being taken in war, by sale, by way of punishment, or by being born in a state of servitude. The masters had an absolute power over their slaves. They might scourge or put them to death at

pleasure. When slaves were beaten, they were commonly suspended, with a weight tied to their feet that they might not move. When punished capitally, they were crucified. If a master of a family was slain at his own house, and the murderer not discovered, all his servants were liable to be put to death. We find no less than 400 in one family punished on this account. Slaves were not esteemed as persons, but as things, and might be transferred from one owner to another, like any other effects. They could not appear as witnesses in a court of justice, nor make a will, nor inherit anything, nor serve as soldiers, nor was there any regular marriage among them.

The influence of domestic slavery on ancient commerce was exceedingly injurious.

Slavery prevailed more or less in all ancient nations. The lands were cultivated by slaves—the various branches of manufacture were carried on by slaves. Each landlord had an establishment of slaves, whose labour supplied him with most of the articles necessary for his domestic consumption. In some cases, the slaves sold, for the benefit of their masters, the articles they had made. Commerce was carried on chiefly by freedmen, or the inferior class of citizens.

The result of this was that manufacturing labour was looked upon with contempt. In all slave countries there is an aversion to labour, at least an aversion to that kind of labour which is performed by slaves. At the commencement of the Roman state, agriculture was considered honourable, and the greatest of her sons worked at the plough; but, when agriculture was performed by slaves, the citizens refrained from labour, and Rome imported her provisions from abroad. This change produced disastrous effects. As the poorer citizens could not engage in manual work, they were, when not engaged in war, dependent on the bounty of the state, and received a certain sum for their support. Had not slavery existed they might have become artisans; but, as slaves were artisans, the citizens became paupers.

But this was not the worst. Had the citizens received with quietness the public bounty, the evil would have been

comparatively light; but wealthy men, who were ambitious of political honours, sought to attain their object by feasting the poorer citizens. Hence, every rich man had the means of keeping constantly in his pay a turbulent party, who would go any lengths in support of the man from whom they derived their subsistence; and, as they were all soldiers, they were ready to embroil their country in a civil war in support of their patron. It was by means only of his wealth that Crassus obtained the chief honours of the state.

The institution of slavery compelled every citizen to be a soldier. Had no foreign wars been feared, it would still have been found necessary that every citizen should acquire the use of arms, in order to keep down the slaves. A slave country resembles a sleeping volcano—an eruption may take place in a moment—the citizens must be always on their guard. The military spirit which was thus maintained was exceedingly unfriendly to commerce.

Notwithstanding this military spirit, the defensive position of a country is weakened by slavery. In a country where all are free, every man, in case of invasion, will become a soldier: the weaver will leave his loom, the dealer his shop, the husbandman his plough—all fly to arms to fight for their country. But a slave has no country; it matters not to him who may be the proprietor of the soil on which he is doomed to labour. The slaves cannot be trusted with arms to fight for their masters, because they may turn those arms against their masters.

Again, slaves *consume* less than freemen; hence the imports of a country will be less. They are not allowed those comforts and luxuries in which, were they free, they would be able to indulge. Slaves also *produce* less than freemen; hence the exports of a country will be less. It is the interest of a slave to work as little as he can, as his remuneration will be the same; it is the interest of a freeman to work as much as he can, because his reward is in proportion to his work.

Slavery is an obstacle to improvement in the art of production. People who have laid out large sums of money in

the erection of machines sometimes object to the introduction of new machinery, lest they should diminish the value of the old. So, in slave countries, the proprietors do not introduce machinery, because the value of the slaves will thus be diminished; and the slaves themselves do not invent machinery, nor probably would their invention be adopted if they did. In these respects slavery is injurious to commerce.

II. We will notice those institutions that have a reference to travelling, and the conveyance of letters.

Dr. Adam states, that the public ways were, perhaps, the greatest of all the Roman works. They were made with great labour and expense, and extended to the utmost limits of the empire, from the pillars of Hercules to the Euphrates, and the southern confines of Egypt. The first road which the Romans paved was to Capua, afterwards continued to Brundusium, about 350 miles long. It was paved with the hardest flint, so firmly, that in several places it remains entire to this day. It was so broad that two carriages might pass one another. The stones were of different sizes, from one to five feet every way, but so artfully joined that they appeared but one stone. There were two strata below; the first strata of rough stones, cemented by mortar, and the second of gravel, the whole being about three feet thick. The roads were so raised as to command a prospect of the adjacent country. On each side there was usually a row of larger stones for foot-passengers. The charge of the public ways was intrusted only to men of the highest dignity. From the principal ways there were cross roads, which led to some places of less note. The inns, or stages along the roads, were commonly at the distance of half a day's journey from each other. At a less distance there were places for relays, where the public couriers changed horses. These horses were kept in constant readiness, at the expense of the emperor, but could only be used by those employed on the public service, without a particular permission, notified to the innkeeper by a diploma. The Romans had no public posts as we have.

The first invention of public couriers is ascribed to Cyrus. Augustus first introduced them among the Romans, but they were employed only to forward political despatches, or to convey intelligence. It is surprising they were not sooner used for the purposes of commercial and private communication. Louis XI. first established them in France in the year 1474; but it was not till the first of Charles II., anno 1660, that the post-office was settled in England by Act of Parliament.

The state of its post-office is, perhaps, in modern times, no bad criterion of the state of knowledge and civilization which exists in any country. Nothing is of more importance to a merchant than a rapid conveyance of letters. It is of importance to him to have the earliest information of any events that may affect his trade—of any change in the markets—of the character or failure of his correspondents—of the payment or non-payment of his bills, of the execution of his orders, or of the despatch of his merchandise. In all modern nations the carrying of letters has been undertaken by the government. It is found that when a large number of letters are despatched at the same time, a moderate charge upon each is not only sufficient to bear the expense of the carriage, but leaves a surplus that affords a considerable revenue to the state.

III. Those institutions that have a reference to buying and selling; the chief of these relate to money and banking.

The Romans, like other ancient nations, had, at first, no coined money, but either exchanged commodities against one another, or used a certain weight of uncoined brass. The various names of money also denoted weights, in the same way as with us, who now use the word "pound" to denote a coin, whereas it first denoted a pound of silver. Indeed, we have borrowed this practice from the Romans; and over the figures that denote the pounds, we do not place the letter P, but the letter L—the first letter in the word *libra*—the Latin word for a pound. The Roman pound was equal to about twelve ounces avoirdupois.

The table of Roman money would stand thus:—

10 *asses* make one *denarius.*

25 *denarii* make one *aureus.*

The *as* was of brass, the *denarius* of silver, and the *aureus* of gold.

All the Roman money was originally of brass; and hence the word *as,* which in Latin denotes brass, is also employed to denote money. Silver was not coined in Rome until the year of the city 484; that is, 269 years before the Christian era,—and gold, 62 years later, or 207 years before the Christian era.

Servius Tullius first stamped pieces of brass with the image of cattle, oxen, and swine. The Latin name for these is *pecudes,* hence, money was called *pecunia;* from which we derive our word pecuniary. The AS was a brass coin that weighed a pound. There were other brass coins weighing one-half, one-fourth, and one-sixth of a pound.

The practice of depreciating the currency, by issuing coins, sustaining the same names as the previous coins, but containing a less quantity of metal, was adopted by the Romans to a greater extent than in our own country. With us, a pound weight of silver that was formerly coined into twenty shillings, is now coined into sixty-six shillings. In the first Punic war money became so scarce that the Romans coined *asses* that weighed only two ounces, or the sixth part of a pound, which passed for the same value as those of a pound weight had done; by this means the republic gained five-sixths, and thus discharged its debts. Such an example could not fail to have imitators among succeeding statesmen. In the second Punic war, while Fabius was dictator, the *asses* were made to weigh only one ounce, and subsequently they were reduced to half an ounce.

The *denarius* was of silver. The Romans had three silver coins—the *denarius,* the *quinarius,* and the *sestertius.* The first was equal to ten *asses,* that is, to ten pounds of brass; the second, to five *asses;* and the third, to two *asses* and a-half.

A pound of silver was coined into a hundred *denarii;* so that, at first, a pound of silver was equal to a thousand pounds of brass, a circumstance which proves that silver was then comparatively scarce. But afterwards the case was altered; for, when the weight of the *as* was diminished, it bore the same proportion to the *denarius* as before, till it was reduced to one ounce, and then a *denarius* passed for sixteen *asses.* The weight of the silver money also varied, and was different under the emperors from what it had been under the republic.

We translate the word *denarius* by the word penny, and over figures denoting pence we put the letter D, being the first letter in the word *denarius,* the Latin for a penny. But the Roman penny was not made of copper, nor of brass, but of silver, and, at the time of the Christian era, was worth about sevenpence-halfpenny of our money. We learn from the New Testament history, that the Roman penny bore the image and superscription of the emperor, and was used in the payment of taxes; that it was the usual wages for a day's labour; and that twopence would provide a night's entertainment at a public inn.

The *aureus* was of gold. It was first struck at Rome in the second Punic war (207 years before the Christian era), and was equal in weight to two and a half *denarii,* and in value to twenty-five *denarii,* or one hundred *sestertia.* The common rate of gold to silver, under the republic, was tenfold. At first, forty *aurei* were made from a pound of gold; but, under the later emperors, they were mixed with alloy, and thus their intrinsic value was diminished.

Among the Romans, money was computed by the *sestertium.* A *sestertium* was the name of a sum, not of a coin, and was equal to a thousand of the coins called *sestertius.* A *sestertius* is equal in English money to one penny, three farthings, and three-fourths of a farthing.

The system of banking at Rome was somewhat similar to that which is in use in modern times. Into these institutions the state or the men of wealth caused their revenues to be paid, and they settled their accounts with their creditors by giving a draft or cheque on the bank. If the creditor also

had an account at the same bank, the account was settled by an order to make the transfer of so much money from one name to another. These bankers, too, were money-changers. They also lent money on interest, and allowed a lower rate of interest on money deposited in their hands. In a country where commerce was looked upon with contempt, banking could not be deemed very respectable. Among most of the ancient agricultural nations, there was a prejudice against the taking of interest for the loan of money. Hence, the private bankers at Rome were sometimes held in disrepute, but those whom the government had established as public cashiers, or receivers-general, as we may term them, held so exalted a rank, that some of them became consuls.

The Romans had also loan-banks, from which the poor citizens received loans without paying interest. We are told, that the confiscated property of criminals was converted into a fund by Augustus Cæsar, and that from this fund sums of money were lent, without interest, to those citizens who could pledge value to double the amount. The same system was pursued by Tiberius. He advanced a large capital, which was lent for a term of two or three years to those who could give landed security to double the value of the loan. Alexander Severus reduced the market-rate of interest, by lending sums of money at a low rate, and by advancing money to poor citizens to purchase lands, and agreeing to receive payment from the produce.

The deity who presided over commerce and banking was Mercury, who, by a strange association, was also the god of thieves and of orators. The Romans, who looked upon merchants with contempt, fancied there was a resemblance between theft and merchandise; and they easily found a figurative connection between theft and eloquence, and hence, thieves, merchants, and orators were placed under the superintendence of the same deity. On the 17th of May in each year the merchants held a public festival, and walked in procession to the temple of Mercury, for the purpose, as the satirists said, of begging pardon of the deity for all the lying and cheating they had found it

convenient to practise, in the way of business, during the preceding year.

IV. Those institutions that have a reference to insurances.

The Romans are said to have introduced the practice of the insurance of ships. This is of the highest importance to a nation having many ships. If a register were kept of all the ships engaged in any particular trade, and a record of all those which, during a certain period, had been wrecked, it would be easy, after a time, to construct a table showing what premiums an owner ought to pay to any party who would insure his ship. If the ship is not lost, the insurers have the premiums as their profit, as pay for the risk they have run; if the ship is lost, the insurers pay the value to the owner; and thus, a loss that might ruin an individual, becomes divided among a number of parties, who can better afford it. Now, such registers are kept, and this kind of business is extensively carried on in most large maritime cities. You have heard of the underwriters at Lloyd's. The underwriters are marine insurers. If a person wishes to insure his ship, he submits all the particulars of the ship, the voyage, and the cargo, to these parties, and each individual *under writes* his name and the amount to which he is disposed to insure. To a maritime nation, this practice is of high importance.

The principles of life insurance are the same as those of marine insurance. You must first get a record of the number of persons that die, out of a certain population. These records are called "bills of mortality," and from these are constructed "tables," showing how long a person of any given age is likely to live; this term is called "the probability of life." Having obtained this, you can easily calculate how much a year he ought to pay during his life to entitle his executors to receive 1,000*l.* or any other sum, at his death, taking into account the rate of interest at which these annual payments are presumed to accumulate, and the profits to be made by the party who grants the insurance.

We are not aware that any of the nations of antiquity kept a register of the births and deaths, so as to form the founda-

tion of tables of mortality sufficiently minute for the purposes of life assurance. Such tables are of very modern date even in our own country. The oldest tables we have are the Northampton, calculated by Dr. Price, from the bills of mortality in the town of Northampton. There is an easy rule by which any of you may know the probability of your own lives, according to the Northampton Tables :—Take your own age from the number 86, divide the remainder by 2, and that will give the probability of life. Thus :—Suppose you are now 20 years of age ; take 20 from 86, that leaves 66 ; divide 66 by 2, and you have 33, which is the probable number of years that you will live—it is the average duration of life of persons of your age.

Three new facts have recently been discovered in the science of life insurance. First, that people live longer now than they did a century ago. Secondly, that the wealthy classes live longer than the indigent. Thirdly, that ladies live longer than gentlemen.

People live longer now than they did a century ago :—By this it is not meant that the extreme of life is prolonged, but that fewer people die at an earlier age. Thus, if we compare the Carlisle and the Northampton Tables, we shall find the following results :—

	Northampton. Years.	*Carlisle.* Years.
At 66 years of age, the expectation of life is .	13	14
50 ,, ,, ,, .	17	21
40 ,, ,, ,, .	23	27
30 ,, ,, ,, .	28	34
20 ,, ,, ,, .	33	41

And, at birth, the expectation of life by the Northampton Tables, is 25 years, and by the Carlisle Tables, 38. Thus, the difference between the two tables, at 60 years of age, is only one year, and on the day of birth it is 13 years. So people do not live to a more advanced age now than some persons did a hundred years ago, but fewer die young. This improvement in the expectation of life is the result probably of increased regard to cleanliness on the part of the poor, to increased attention paid to the public health, to the improve-

ments in medical science, and particularly to the discovery of vaccination. This increased prolongation of life is not confined to England. In France, it has been estimated that the value of life has been doubled since the fourteenth century, and has gained nearly one-third since the year 1781.

Another new fact connected with life assurance is, that the wealthy classes live longer than the indigent. Although the late hours, the crowded assemblies, and the variety of indulgences enjoyed by the wealthy must be considered unfavourable to longevity, yet, on the other hand, they are exempt from the evils of want, from the scarcity of food, and from the anxieties of business. If unwell, they have the best medical advice, and can immediately remove to any part of the country that is more friendly to their recovery. Hence, the lives of the rich are better than those of the poor.

Though females are exposed to some contingencies from which men are exempt, yet, from being more free from dangerous employments, and from cares and anxieties of mind, and, especially, from being more temperate in the use of wine and ardent spirits, they live longer than men. A medical writer has pleasantly remarked, that one cause of the superior longevity of women may be, that they talk more; talking, by exercising the lungs, being exceedingly beneficial to health.

The original object of life insurance was to enable a person to secure to his family the receipt of a certain sum at his death. But it is now applied also to a variety of commercial purposes. Some people insure the lives of their debtors, others insure their own lives for the benefit of their creditors. In every form, the system seems to produce unmingled good. It promotes habits of forethought and economy on the part of the insured, and tends, by the accumulation of savings, to increase the amount of the national capital.

We may reasonably expect that this system will be extended and improved. We may hereafter have tables that shall show the expectation of life, not only in regard to people in health, but also to those afflicted with every kind of disease; and shall also show the effect of different occupations and localities on the duration of life. The system of insurance

may be applied to every calamity, as soon as we have tables that will show correctly the probability of its occurrence. We thus find, that the study of statistics, the least inviting in appearance of all the sciences, has produced most important benefits ; and that even Death, capricious as he seems, may have his course previously marked out by the hand of Science.

We have thus, in our present lecture, considered Rome as an agricultural tribe, a warlike nation, and an extended empire. We have also taken a view of some of her social institutions that have a reference to domestic slavery, travelling and the conveyance of letters, money and banking, and marine insurances.

We shall now bring under your notice the commercial character of the Romans.

1. The Romans were honourable men.

However strongly we may condemn the spirit of war, we must not suppose that the profession of arms is incompatible with personal excellence of character. We read, in the New Testament, of an officer in the Roman army who was "a devout man, and one that feared God, with all his house, who gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God alway"—whose "prayers were heard, and whose alms were had in remembrance in the sight of God." And, in the same book, we have a confirmation of the honourable character of the Roman law, which was very different from that which prevailed among Asiatic nations. "It is not the manner of the Romans to deliver any man to die, before that he which is accused have the accusers face to face, and have license to answer for himself concerning the crime laid against him."

A merchant should be an honourable man. Although a man cannot be an honourable man without being an honest man, yet a man may be strictly honest without being honourable. Honesty refers to pecuniary affairs ; honour refers to the principles and feelings. You may pay your debts punctually, you may defraud no man, and yet you may act dishonourably. You act dishonourably when you give your correspondents a worse opinion of your rivals in trade than you know they deserve. You act dishonourably when you sell

your commodities at less than their real value, in order to get away your neighbour's customers. You act dishonourably when you purchase at higher than the market price, in order that you may raise the market upon another buyer. You act dishonourably when you draw accommodation bills, and pass them to your banker for discount, as if they arose out of real transactions. You act dishonourably in every case wherein your external conduct is at variance with your real opinions. You act dishonourably if, when carrying on a prosperous trade, you do not allow your servants and assistants, through whose exertions you obtain your success, to participate in your prosperity. You act dishonourably if, after you have become rich, you are unmindful of the favours you received when you were poor. In all these cases there may be no intentional fraud. It may not be dishonest, but it is dishonourable conduct.

2. The Romans were patriotic men. They loved their country; and a merchant should love his country. When we say that a merchant is a citizen of the world, and is free from national prejudices, think not we mean that a merchant has no attachment to his country; think not we mean, that the land of his forefathers—the land in which his ancestors lived and acted, and in which their ashes now repose—the land which gave him birth, and the land of his earliest associations —the land, under the laws of which he has acquired wealth, and in whose institutions he participates—the land, the language of which awakens the sweetest and the holiest associations; —think not we mean that he regards this land with no sentiments of filial regard,—no feelings of preference,—no aspirations for her honour and prosperity. No! 'tis a false philosophy that would tell us to merge all individual or local attachments in one general feeling of philanthropy. He who has no personal attachments has no general attachments. He who does not love his country has no love for mankind. Local attachment is the basis of general attachment. He who is the best husband, the best father, and the best friend, he it is that will make the best philanthropist. While, therefore, a merchant is free from that littleness of mind which would induce him to despise other nations, he is still

susceptible of all the delightful sensations that arise from pure and disinterested patriotism. He should love his country too well to encourage the industry of other countries to the injury of his own. He should cheerfully pay those taxes or duties which the laws of his country have imposed for the public good. He should readily serve those offices in the commonwealth, though burdensome or expensive, which his station in society imposes upon him. He should use his influence in preserving order, in maintaining the rights of property, and in upholding the supremacy of the law. He should liberally support those institutions that have for their objects the preservation of the public morals, the diffusion of useful knowledge, and the relief of the distresses of the poor. Ah! it is here that patriotism gathers her sweetest and her softest laurels,—laurels which will give composure to the head that wears them, and which will maintain their freshness when the blood-stained garland of the conquerer shall have faded into insignificance, or have withered into oblivion.

3. The Romans were grave, methodical, and systematic men.

They conducted everything upon system. They owed their success in arms to their superior discipline. They maintained their dominion by acting upon certain fixed principles, and by the uniformity with which they adhered to these principles. Rome was not built in a day. The Roman empire was not the result of one daring enterprise, one bold speculation, one grand achievement,—it was the result of adhering for centuries to fixed rules of action. The sons adopted the maxims of their fathers, and generation after generation followed up those principles which experience had shown to be adapted to the end in view. This may teach us some important commercial lessons. A nation, a company, or an individual, who shall for a length of time adhere inflexibly to sound rules of conduct, will seldom fail of success. The road to wealth is a beaten road, and it requires but ordinary sagacity to discover the path. Industry, honesty, prudence, and perseverance, these are the finger-posts that will direct your steps; follow their guidance, and the end will be gained. But you who

disregard the counsels of experience—you gratify your love of self-indulgence—you nourish the spirit of speculation—you stray from the right path, and meddle with matters that you do not understand—and when you have reaped the fruit of your own doings, then you tell your creditors that you have been "unfortunate;" and the hard earnings of their honest industry are swept away, and their families are pinched in their enjoyments, because you have thought proper to follow a course of unprincipled recklessness.

A merchant should not only be systematic in his adherence to right principles, he should also be so in the details of his counting-house. In everything, system is essential to a merchant. He should be systematic in the arrangement of his business, systematic in the division of his labours, systematic in the keeping of his books, systematic in the employment of his time. By system, he saves much time, avoids hurried feelings, and gets through much more work. I do not think the better of a merchant if I see him always in a hurry; if he tells me that he received my letter, but was so hurried that he had not time to answer it, or that he put it somewhere among his papers, and when he wished to answer it he could not find it. A man who acts systematically will arrange his business beforehand, and thus find time to do it all.

4. The Romans were not loquacious men. They were much inferior to the Greeks in vividness of imagination and in affluence of speech. I do not, by any means, intend to recommend taciturnity in general company. Conversation is one of the means by which knowledge is communicated, and the character of mankind is improved. As rough diamonds become smooth by being shaken together in a bag, so the asperities of men are softened down by their intercourse with each other. But it adds nothing to the character of a merchant, to make use of many words in matters of business; this argues either great indecision of character, or great prodigality of time. Time is money; talk as much as you please when you have nothing else to do, but don't talk more than is necessary until your business is done. The late Mr. Wesley, the venerable founder of the body of the Wesleyan

Methodists, a body who have done much good in educating the poor, laid it down as one qualification for admission into his society, that the candidate should not use many words in buying and selling. A most excellent rule, and one which, if steadily adhered to, would save much time, and produce other good effects.

Not only should you avoid many words in commercial conversation, you should also avoid too many words in your commercial correspondence. Long letters on matters of business are exceedingly tiresome. Let all your letters be as short as the subject will admit. Come at once to the point, express your meaning clearly in a few plain words, and then close. The man who introduces a variety of unnecessary circumstances, who is fond of using tropes and figures of speech, or has a lengthy, prosy style, is very ill qualified to conduct the correspondence of a commercial establishment. You ought also to be careful to write a plain hand; you impose upon your correspondents a very unnecessary and a very unpleasant tax if you require them to go over your letters two or three times in order to decipher your writing. It is presumed, that when you write a letter, you write for the purpose of communicating your ideas to the person to whom the letter is addressed; why, then, throw difficulties in the way, by writing in an illegible hand? A business hand is equally opposed to a very fine hand. A letter written in fine, elegant writing, adorned with a variety of flourishes, will give your correspondents no very high opinion of you as a man of business. Some persons have contended that a man's character may be discovered by his handwriting. It may be doubted whether a man's intellectual powers can be ascertained in this way, but perhaps his moral qualities may thus be sometimes exhibited. For instance, if he write an illegible hand, it may be inferred that he is not very anxious about the comfort of the parties to whom he writes.

5. The great defect in the commercial character of the Romans was their military spirit.

In every age of the world military men have looked upon merchants as a class vastly inferior to their own. And this

will always be the case, so long as mankind shall pay more respect to the arts of war than to the arts of peace. But it is more surprising, that merchants themselves, instead of forming more correct notions of their own importance, have fallen in with the popular prejudice, and aped the manners of the military class. Hence, we find that merchants have sometimes settled their disputes with each other by duelling. That military men should do this may excite no surprise. Though, when we consider, that among the heroic Greeks and the martial Romans the practice of duelling was unknown, it can never be contended that this practice is necessary to maintain the personal courage of our military officers. On this ground we might also permit duelling among the common men. But if military men, when they have none of their country's enemies to shoot, wish to keep themselves in practice by shooting one another, they may allege that they are acting according to the principles of their profession. But nothing can be more out of character than for a mercantile man to be engaged in a duel. When a case came before the late Lord Ellenborough, in which one merchant had attempted to provoke another to fight a duel, his Lordship observed, that merchants would be much better employed in posting their books than posting one another.

One effect of the military spirit is, that it frequently leads to cruelty of disposition. The Romans were cruel men, cruel towards their slaves, cruel towards their conquered enemies, cruel in their punishments, cruel in their amusements. No disposition is more opposed than this to the spirit of commerce, and yet, on some occasions, merchants have become the instruments of cruelty. Is there nothing cruel in selling spirituous liquors to half-civilized nations?—nothing cruel in supplying the munitions of war to untutored tribes who would otherwise remain at peace?—and was there nothing cruel in the African slave trade—a traffic that must be numbered among the blackest of our country's crimes, the most crimson of our national sins? Merchants should not only act honestly in their trade, but should also ascertain that the trade itself is an honest trade. For, although it be true, upon the ordinary

principles of profit and loss, that honesty is the best policy, yet we should not practise honesty solely from motives of policy, nor infer the honesty of an enterprise from its apparent policy. Beware of taking a mere commercial view of questions of morality. Crimes the most atrocious have sometimes been profitable. But you see not the whole of the balance-sheet. There are items in the account which no arithmetic can express. What estimate will you place upon infamy of character, remorse of conscience, the retributive justice of God in the present life, and his vengeance in the next? Take these into your calculation, and then sum up the amount of your gains.

But as commerce extends her sway, the military spirit may be expected to subside, and peace and equity prevail. Commerce will teach mankind that it is their interest to live at peace with each other. Commerce will teach the slave-owner that the man who keeps in bondage his fellow-man, sins no less against his own interest than against the feelings of humanity and the injunctions of religion. Commerce will show to those who "sit in high places," that the vulgar maxim, "Honesty is the best policy" is as applicable to the affairs of communities as to the transactions of individuals, and that what is morally wrong can never be politically right. Commerce will inculcate upon nations, that the prosperity of one people is not an injury, but an advantage to the others; that national greatness can arise only from superiority in industry and in knowledge; and that nations, like individuals, should seek each other's welfare, and endeavour to promote universal peace. When these sentiments are acknowledged, the demon of national discord will be driven from the earth —the clangour of arms, and the shrieks of the vanquished will be heard no more—and the Genius of War, in his dying moments, will surrender the palm of victory into the hands of Commerce.

LECTURE V.

THE COMMERCE OF THE ACNIENTS WITH THE EAST INDIES.

Origin of Luxury. India—Its Social Institutions. Productions—Spices—Precious Stones—Silk. Indian Commerce previous to the time of Alexander the Great. Conquests of Alexander. Alexandria founded. Conquest of Egypt by the Romans. Silk sold at Rome for its weight in gold. Conquest of Egypt by the Mahometans. Importation of Silkworms into Europe. Discovery of the Passage to India by the Cape of Good Hope. Exportation of Bullion—Principles of the Foreign Exchanges. Conclusion.

After having considered the commerce of ancient Egypt, Greece, Tyre and Carthage, and Rome, I shall now conclude this course of Lectures by a consideration of the commerce of the ancients with the East Indies.

Almost every country produces the necessaries of life: and were mankind satisfied with those things only which are essential to existence, they would seldom engage in commerce. The object of commerce is to obtain the conveniences and luxuries of life. We acknowledge that it is not easy to draw the line of demarcation between necessaries and luxuries—to say at what precise point necessaries end and luxuries begin. Food of some kind is a necessary of life; but in some climates it is possible to live without clothing and without a settled habitation: here clothing and dwellings are luxuries. Some writers have distinguished between primary and secondary necessaries. The primary necessaries are those which are essential to existence, such as food, and in some climates, clothing and lodging. The secondary necessaries are those which are essential to comfortable existence, such as shoes

and stockings, household furniture, and similar articles; and luxuries are those which mankind could very conveniently do without, such as spices, gold and silver, silks, furs, and precious stones. We need not be very anxious about this classification. We know there is a distinction between luxuries and necessaries, and, although there may be difficulty in ascertaining under which denomination some commodities ought to be arranged, yet, in by far the majority of cases, no such difficulty exists.

In the present Lecture, I will take the term "luxury" in its most restricted signification, as denoting things which are not essential to comfortable existence. If you ask me what things are luxuries, I will say, diamonds, pearls, and precious stones are luxuries. With regard to your taste, pepper, nutmeg, and various spices and sauces are luxuries. With regard to smell, all kinds of perfumes and snuffs are luxuries. With regard to hearing, music is a luxury. With regard to clothing, gold chains, diamonds, pearls, and precious stones, and all sorts of gems, are luxuries. With regard to furniture, all ornaments are luxuries, and even many of those articles which custom has induced us to consider as indispensable conveniences.

Man, in even a savage state, is not satisfied without some one or other of the luxuries of life. To those luxuries that have a reference to diet or to lodging he is more indifferent than to those which have a reference to dress. But here, unlike the practice of civilized life, the man monopolizes to himself all the finery he can collect, and gives none to the woman. It is her business to assist in decorating her lord and master. But when man has renounced the savage state, and betaken himself to the cultivation of the soil, the circle of his luxuries becomes enlarged. It is soon found that the man who cultivates the earth can produce more food than is necessary for his own subsistence. The surplus of this food he is willing to impart to the man who has no ground to cultivate, upon receiving some value in return. In a rude state of society, when the arts and sciences are but imperfectly known, the number of those who minister to luxury will not be numerous. But, as improved modes of cultivation, and means of abridging

labour, are discovered, those who cultivate the soil will have a larger amount of surplus produce to exchange for luxuries; and, at the same time, those who supply the luxuries will be able to give a larger quantity for the same value. As the division of labour becomes extended, and human exertion is assisted by the introduction of machinery, the quantity of commodities produced will be increased, the articles of luxury will be multiplied, new conveniences will be discovered, artificial wants will be created, and, again, new inventions supplied for their gratification. The increase of wealth will enable many to live without labour. These will employ their time in cultivating their taste, or in the acquisition of knowledge; hence will arise literature, and the study of the sciences.

Luxuries, then, arise from wealth. When comes wealth, then comes luxury. 'Tis not the taste for luxuries that causes them to be produced; but they are first produced, and then men have a desire for them, and by use, they come at last to think them necessary.

It may be observed, that articles which at first were luxuries, ceased to be regarded as such when they became abundant. Tea and sugar were at first luxuries, and their enjoyment was confined to the wealthy, and so were many other articles of diet, and of dress. Had they never been enjoyed as luxuries, they would never have become abundant. As the taste for them increased, the cultivation was increased, and the supply increased; they became abundant and, consequently, cheap. Linen, and cotton, and silk, which were luxuries among the Romans, are now enjoyed in great abundance by even the ordinary classes in our own country. The family of a tradesman is now more finely attired than the wives and daughters of the Roman emperors. Glass windows were originally a luxury, but are now very common.

The effect of a taste for luxury is to stimulate industry. As the enjoyment of luxuries is attended with pleasure, people are willing to undergo some degree of labour in order to obtain them. The supply of luxuries furnishes employment to a large number of labourers, who would otherwise be idle. The class who supply luxuries become usually more wealthy

than those who supply bare necessaries, and form a middle class in society, who are equally distant from the owners and from the cultivators of the soil. We cannot observe the effects of luxuries better than by contrasting the present state of Europe with its state during the middle ages. At that period, the food, the clothing, and the lodgings of the population were of the plainest kind. The owners of the soil were the only wealthy men, and the surplus produce which was paid to them as rent, was employed in maintaining in idleness a number of retainers, who were ready to obey their orders, and to fight their battles. Upon the introduction of luxury, the landowner employed his rent, not in maintaining retainers, but in purchasing those articles of finery for which he had a taste. The retainers could now support themselves only by producing those commodities for which the new taste of the landowner created a demand. From idle dependents, they became industrious artisans. The landowners vied with each other, not in bringing into the field a number of men to kill one another, but in the elegance of their dress, their houses, or their equipage, in their taste for the fine arts, or in their literary or intellectual attainments. There are other advantages arising from luxury. When the mass of the people enjoy a variety of luxuries they have a resource in seasons of scarcity. If they live on the lowest kind of food, and the supply of that food should fail, they cannot substitute a better kind, because it is dearer. Some people have complained against the luxuries which consume those articles which are used as food; but so far from being condemned, they ought to be regarded as storehouses against famine.

It must, however, be admitted, that when people indulge in luxuries which they cannot afford, the result is injurious to themselves and others; and it is probably on this account that sumptuary laws, or laws against luxury, have been established, both in ancient and in modern times.

Among the Romans, the sumptuary laws were numerous. By one law, the number of guests at feasts was limited, though without any limitation of the charges. By another law, it was enacted that more than 10 *asses* should not be spent at an

ordinary entertainment. For the solemn festivals, as the Saturnalia, &c., 100 *asses* were allowed, 10 of which was the price of a sheep, and 100 of an ox. By a subsequent law it was decreed, that the former sumptuary laws should be in force, not only in Rome, but throughout all Italy, and for every transgression, not only the master of the feast, but all the guests, too, should be liable to the penalty. The spirit of these laws has been adopted in comparatively modern times. In 1337, luxury was restricted in England by a law wherein the prelates and nobility were confined to two courses at every meal, and two kinds of food in every course, except on great festivals. It also prohibited all who did not enjoy a free estate of 100*l.* per annum, from wearing furs, skins, or silk; and the use of foreign cloth was confined to the royal family alone, to all others it was prohibited. Under Henry IV., it was proclaimed, that no man should wear shoes above six inches broad at the toes; and, under Edward IV., no person under the condition of a lord was allowed to wear a short mantle. In Ireland, a law was passed, in the year 1447, against gilt bridles and harness. It enacted, that if any person should be so hardy as to ride a horse with a gilt bridle or harness, any person who chose should be at liberty to seize the horse, bridle, and harness, and keep it for his own use, and as his own property.

In every age the choicest luxuries have been imported from India; yet the social institutions of India were not friendly to commerce. The population of India, like that of ancient Egypt, was divided into *castes;* the individuals of these *castes* could not intermarry, nor leave the employment to which they were born. Hence, there was but little invention in India, but considerable dexterity in manual operations; and the manufactures of India, in those remote times, were superior to those of Europe. The other institutions of India seem also to have fostered feelings unfriendly to trade; the natives could not leave their country, and they had an aversion to the sea, hence navigation and commerce could not flourish. They were also prohibited the use of animal food; so, while they were temperate and amiable, they were, at the same time,

deficient in strength, in courage, in enterprise, and in a taste for the comforts and enjoyments of life. The fertility of their own land furnished them with all the commodities they desired, and their trade was chiefly a trade of export, in which they have sold their superfluous commodities for the money of other countries. Their exports consisted chiefly of spices, precious stones, and silk, for which they received payment, mostly in gold and silver. Of these we shall speak more hereafter.

I shall distinguish the history of the trade to India into the following epochs:—

I. The trade to India previous to the time of Alexander the Great—B.C. 331.

II. The trade of India, from the time of Alexander the Great to the conquest of Egypt by the Romans—B.C. 30.

III. The trade to India, from the conquest of Egypt by the Romans, to the conquest of Egypt by the Mahometans—A.D. 649.

IV. The trade to India, from the conquest of Egypt by the Mahometans, to the discovery of the passage to India by the Cape of Good Hope—A.D. 1498.

First.—The trade with India previous to the time of Alexander the Great.

Previous to the time of Alexander, the Greeks had no direct commercial intercourse with India. The Persian empire, which included all the countries between Greece and India, and also Egypt, interposed, and would have effectually prevented any commercial intercourse, even had the states of Greece been disposed to engage in this kind of trade. The Egyptians, the Phœnicians, the Jews, and the Persians, might, however, have engaged in this traffic, and probably all of them, at some period or other of their history, had commercial intercourse with India.

Although a similarity between the social institutions of Egypt and of India has led some writers to believe that there must have been originally a great intercourse between the two countries; yet we have no historical account of any trade between them at that early period. If the history of Sesostris be true, he conquered all the lands on the sea-coast between

Egypt and India; but if these conquests were made, they were not long retained by the Egyptians. The Indian commodities, for which they had occasion in the embalming of their dead, or for other purposes, were probably purchased from the Arabian merchants, who, after the manner of the East, periodically visited Egypt, to sell their merchandise.

The Phœnicians of Tyre and Sidon carried on an extensive trade with India. They took possession of some harbours at the bottom of the Arabian Gulf. The Indian commodities were brought from thence by land to the coast of the Mediterranean Sea, where they were re-shipped for Tyre.

The Jews, in the reign of David, conquered from the Edomites the ports of Elath and Eziongeber, situated on the Red Sea. In the reign of Solomon, fleets were fitted out from these ports for Tarshish and Ophir, from whence were imported gold and silver, and precious stones, and ivory, apes, and peacocks. Among learned men, there is a difference of opinion as to whether these places are situated in the East Indies, or on the eastern coast of Africa; the latter opinion now generally prevails. If this be the case, the Jews cannot be numbered among those nations who traded to India by sea; and we have no certain evidence that they traded thither by land. Solomon built Tadmor in the wilderness. This city was about eighty-five miles from the river Euphrates, and was afterwards much celebrated under the name of Palmyra: it was built on a fertile spot, surrounded by an ocean of sand. Whether Solomon built this city with a view to carry on the trade to India, we are not informed: if so, it is likely that the trade was abandoned by his successors. It seems probable that the Jews obtained all the Indian productions they wanted from the Phœnicians. We are expressly informed, in the twenty-seventh chapter of the prophecy of Ezekiel, that the Jews traded in the fairs of Tyre; and we know, that all the productions of India were exposed for sale in those fairs; indeed, the chief productions for which the Jews had occasion, seem to have been spices and frankincense, to burn in the temple.

During the enterprising reign of Darius, an expedition was

fitted out to explore India. The fleet sailed down the river Indus, and, in the course of two years and six months, reached the Arabian Gulf. From the reports given of the country through which they passed, Darius was induced to attack the country; he extended his conquests as far as the river Indus; and the tribute derived from these provinces formed nearly a third part of the whole revenue of the Persian empire. As Persia lay so near to India, it seems probable that some degree of trade was at all times carried on between these countries. The Persians were remarkable for their luxury and effeminacy; and they had a taste for the spices, the silks, and the other productions imported from India.

Secondly.—The trade with India, from the time of Alexander the Great to the conquest of Egypt by the Romans.

Alexander, the son of Philip, king of Macedon, having been appointed generalissimo of the armies of Greece, overthrew the Persian empire, conquered a part of India, and would probably have conquered the whole, if his soldiers had not refused to follow him. Notwithstanding the character of Alexander was blemished by ambition, intemperance, vanity, passion, and occasional cruelty, yet he was a man of enlarged and enlightened views as a statesman. In the whole page of history, there is no other instance of so young a monarch laying the foundations of so extensive an empire; and so firmly were the foundations laid, that even after his death, the conquered nations quietly submitted to the government of his generals. But if we view the circumstances in which he was placed, we shall not, perhaps, so much wonder at his conquests. He had the command of an army, raised and disciplined by his father, and taught a mode of warfare previously unknown. He had, also, Greek soldiers, who had been kept in practice by their wars with each other; and he was attended by the most enlightened men then in the world. On the other hand, the people he attacked were Asiatics, enervated by a warm climate, and by indolence—people who for two centuries had been but little engaged in war, and who were distributed over many provinces which had but little regard for each other. It must be observed, that though Alexander contended against

the power of Persia, but few of the people, comparatively, were Persians. The Persians, who were previously but a very small nation, had, under Cyrus the Great and some of his successors, made extensive conquests. The inhabitants of the conquered countries, though not strongly opposed to the Persian government, were quite ready to join a new conqueror such as Alexander, who treated his conquered enemies with great generosity. This was especially the case with the Egyptians, who had several times attempted, without success, to throw off the Persian yoke.

Alexander having conquered Persia, penetrated into India, subdued some of its states, and sailing down the Indus, returned by sea to Persia. From the great difficulty which he experienced in the conquest of Tyre, he had full opportunity for witnessing the effects of commerce in giving strength to nations. And, from his conquest of Egypt and India, he could perceive that the Indian trade could be carried on more advantageously through Egypt than by the previous route. To facilitate this trade, he built a new city in Egypt, to which he gave the name of Alexandria, calling it after his own name. After his death, Seleucus seized the Asiatic provinces, and penetrated farther into India than Alexander had done, but the Assyrian monarchs did not maintain any permanent possessions in India.

Ptolemy, another of Alexander's generals, acquired possession of Egypt, and commenced a commercial intercourse with India. The city of Tyre having been destroyed, that branch of the Indian trade which had been carried on by the Phœnicians would now be carried on through Alexandria. The Egyptian monarch paid particular attention to this subject. Ptolemy Philadelphus founded the city of Berenice, on the coast of the Red Sea. The Indian commodities were brought by sea from India to Berenice, then they were carried by land to the city of Coptos, a distance of two hundred and fifty-eight Roman miles, and from Coptos, by water, to Alexandria. In consequence of this trade, Egypt became wealthy and prosperous, until it was conquered by the Romans.

In the meantime, the Persians, and the other subjects of the

Syrian monarchy, obtained the productions of India by land. These commodities were carried by land from the river Indus to the river Oxus, thence to the Caspian Sea, and thus distributed over the northern provinces. The goods intended for the southern provinces were taken from the Caspian Sea to some of the great rivers, and thus circulated throughout the country.

Thirdly.—The trade with India, from the conquest of Egypt by the Romans to its conquest by the Mahometans.

Egypt was conquered by Julius Cæsar about thirty years before the Christian era, and after the battle of Actium was reduced to the form of a Roman province by Augustus. For a hundred years previous to this event, luxury had been advancing rapidly at Rome. The rival power of Carthage had been destroyed, the Roman conquests had extended in all directions, and, latterly, Syria had been subdued by Pompey. The sudden introduction of wealth had led to the most extravagant luxury. This was not the luxury of taste and refinement: it was the luxury of vulgar men, who had suddenly become wealthy; it was the luxury of soldiers carousing in a camp, amid the spoils of victory. Men showed their importance by profuse expense; and to display their wealth was a point of more consequence than to enjoy it.

The taste for luxury at Rome gave a new impulse to the trade to the East Indies. We transcribe from Dr. Robertson's 'Historical Disquisition on Ancient India,' the following account of the estimation in which the productions of India were held at Rome. The chief articles were—First, spices and aromatics. Second, precious stones and pearls. Third, silk:—

First.—Spices and aromatics. From the mode of religious worship in the heathen world—from the incredible number of their deities, and of the temples consecrated to them, the consumption of frankincense and other aromatics, which were used in every sacred function, must have been very great. But the vanity of men occasioned a greater consumption of these fragrant substances than their piety. It was the custom of the Romans to burn the bodies of their dead, and

they deemed it a display of magnificence to cover, not only the body, but the funeral pile on which it was laid, with the most costly spices. At the funeral of Sylla, 210 burdens of spices were strewed upon the pile. Nero is reported to have burnt a quantity of cinnamon and cassia at the funeral of Poppæa, greater than the countries from which it was imported produced in one year. "We consume in heaps these precious substances with the carcases of the dead," says Pliny; "we offer them to the gods only in grains." It was not from India, I am aware, but from Arabia, that aromatics were first imported into Europe; and some of them, particularly frankincense, were productions of that country. But the Arabians were accustomed, together with spices of native growth, to furnish foreign merchants with others of higher value, which they brought from India and the regions beyond it. The commercial intercourse of the Arabians with the eastern parts of Asia was not only early but considerable. By means of their trading caravans, they conveyed into their own country all the valuable productions of the East, among which spices held a chief place. In every ancient account of Indian commodities, spices and aromatics of various kinds form a principal article. Some authors assert that the greater part of those purchased in Arabia were not the growth of that country, but brought from India. That this assertion was well founded, appears from what has been observed in modern times. The frankincense of Arabia, though reckoned the peculiar and most precious production of the country, is much inferior in quality to that imported into it from the East; and it is chiefly with the latter that the Arabians at present supply the extensive demands of various provinces of Asia for this commodity. It is upon good authority, then, that I have mentioned the importation of spices as one of the most considerable branches of ancient commerce with India. In the Augustan age, an entire street in Rome seems to have been occupied by those who sold frankincense, pepper, and other aromatics.

Second.—Precious stones, together with which, pearls may be classed, seem to be the articles next in value imported by

the Romans from the East. As these have no pretension to be of any real use, their value arises entirely from their beauty and their rarity, and even when estimated most moderately is always high. But among nations far advanced in luxury, when they are deemed not only ornaments, but marks of distinction, the vain and the opulent vie so eagerly with one another for the possession of them, that they rise in price to an exorbitant and almost incredible height. Diamonds, though the art of cutting them was imperfectly known to the ancients, held a high place in estimation among them as well as among us. The comparative value of other precious stones varied according to the diversity of tastes and the caprice of fashion. The immense number of them mentioned by Pliny, and the laborious care with which he describes and arranges them, will astonish, I should suppose, the most skilful lapidary or jeweller of modern times, and shows the high request in which they were held by the Romans.

But among all the articles of luxury, the Romans seem to have given the preference to pearls. Persons of every rank purchased them with eagerness; they were worn on every part of dress; and there is such a difference, both in size and in value, among pearls, that while such as were large and of superior lustre adorned the wealthy and the great, smaller ones and of inferior quality gratified the vanity of persons in more humble stations of life. Julius Cæsar presented Servilia, the mother of Brutus, with a pearl, for which he paid 47,457*l.* The famous pearl ear-rings of Cleopatra were in value 161,458*l.* Precious stones, it is true, as well as pearls, were found not only in India, but in many different countries, and all were ransacked in order to gratify the pride of Rome. India, however, furnished the chief part, and its productions were allowed to be most abundant, diversified, and valuable.

Third.—Another production of India in great demand at Rome, was silk; and when we recollect the variety of elegant fabrics into which it may be formed, and how much these have added to the splendour of dress and furniture, we cannot wonder at its being held in such estimation by a luxurious

people. The price it bore was exorbitant; but it was deemed a dress too expensive and too delicate for men, and was appropriated wholly to women of eminent rank and opulence. This, however, did not render the demand for it less eager, especially after the example of the dissolute Elagabalus introduced the use of it among the other sex, and accustomed men to the disgrace (as the severity of ancient ideas accounted it) of wearing this effeminate garb. Contrary to what usually takes place in the operations of trade, the more general use of that commodity seems not to have increased the quantity imported in such proportion as to answer the growing demand for it, and the price of silk was not reduced during the course of 250 years from the time of its being first known in Rome. In the reign of Aurelian, it still continued to be valued at its weight in gold.

After Egypt was conquered by Julius Cæsar, the Romans continued the trade with India, by way of Egypt; and they also opened an intercourse by land by way of Palmyra, the same city which, as we have stated, was, under Solomon, called Tadmor in the wilderness.

Palmyra was situated 85 miles from the Euphrates, and 117 from the Mediterranean Sea, on a fertile spot in the midst of sandy deserts. By means of its trade with India, it arose to great opulence. It was at first under the government of the kings of Syria, and, on the conquest of that kingdom, it remained a free state for upwards of 200 years. It carried on trade with both the rival powers, the Parthians and the Romans; and through this channel, Rome obtained the productions of India. Palmyra was ultimately conquered by Aurelian, and became subject to the Roman empire.

About eighty years after the conquest of Egypt by the Romans, they made an important discovery, which greatly facilitated the trade with India. This was the discovery of the periodical winds, which, from the advantages they confer upon trade, are now called the trade winds. Near the equator, there are regular winds which follow the course of the sun. As the sun passes from east to west, the winds blow, on the north side of the equator N.E., and on the south side S.E., occasionally to

more or less E. These winds, which blow in the same direction all the year round, are called trade winds, from their utility to trade. Thus, if we wish to sail to the West Indies, we sail due south, till we get into the trade winds, and then sail due west. At a greater distance from the equator than the trade winds, are the winds called monsoons. The word monsoon signifies season. These winds blow for six months in the year from east to west, and the remaining six months from west to east. There is such a monsoon as this between the Red Sea and India; between April and October it blows from the N.W., and during the other months from the S.E., keeping constantly parallel to the coast of Arabia. The ancients, who were in the practice of giving names to particular winds, called this wind Hippalus, that being the name of the discoverer. Instead of sailing round the coast as they had hitherto done, they now stretched across the gulf, and thus diminished the time consumed in the voyage. And in this way, the trade to India was carried on for upwards of fourteen hundred years.

After the removal of the seat of government from Rome to Constantinople, in the year 329, the Roman empire was still supplied with the productions of India, by way of Egypt. The trade that might have been carried on between India and Constantinople, by land, was prevented by the Persians.

Although Europe had been receiving the India silk for above a thousand years, they had never known how it was produced. It was supposed to be a sort of down, that grew upon a tree like cotton, or formed of a plant like flax. It was never supposed that this elegant material was the production of a worm. But in the year 581, two Persian monks, who had been on a mission to some Christian churches, which were scattered in some parts of India, had observed the rearing of silkworms, and became acquainted with the process of manufacturing silk. They informed the Emperor Justinian of the true origin of silk, and were induced by his promises of reward, to bring some of the worms into Europe. They, accordingly, brought to Constantinople some of the eggs of the silkworm concealed in a hollow cane. From these were

raised numerous insects, which were carried to different parts of Gaul and Greece, particularly the Peloponesus; and the island of Sicily became remarkable for the production of silk. In proportion as silk was produced at home, the demand for Indian silk of course declined.

Fourthly.—The trade to India from the conquest of Egypt by the Mahometans, to the discovery of the passage by the Cape of Good Hope.

As no trade was carried on between the Mahometan and Christian nations, the capture of Alexandria prevented the nations of Europe obtaining the commodities of India through Egypt. But, such was the anxiety to obtain Indian produce, that the merchants of Constantinople successfully attempted to carry on the Indian trade in a new channel. And, though the route was circuitous, yet, for more than two centuries, Europe was by this means supplied with the commodities of the East.

While the supply of Indian commodities was thus curtailed, the state of Europe at that time diminished the demand. The whole of Europe was in a rude state of society, having but little taste for the enjoyments of life, and little means of purchasing. The most powerful states were in a condition of hostility to each other. The feudal system was established throughout Europe. Each country was thus broken down into a number of small states or baronies. Each baron was anxious to extend the number of his vassals, and thus to acquire distinction among the rulers of the state. War was the only means of acquiring distinction, and the luxuries acquired by commerce were regarded as effeminate and degrading. The entertainments of the nobility were distinguished, not by the choiceness, but by the abundance of the provisions.

The arts and sciences, and, consequently, a taste for luxury, first revived in Italy. The republics of Venice and Genoa turned their attention to commerce. The Venetians procured silkworms from Sicily, and became remarkable for the silk manufacture; they also obtained the productions of India, by way of Constantinople, and supplied the whole of Europe. An important advance in civilization and refinement was

made in western Europe by means of the crusades. Although immense numbers of people were destroyed, yet those who returned brought back with them a taste for the comforts and luxuries of the East. During their absence, too, the cause of good government had been promoted, by the absence of many turbulent barons, and by the annexation to the crown of many large estates. The feudal system received a fatal blow, and order and peace and luxury began to extend. In the year 1204, Venice, assisted by the soldiers of the fourth crusade, who went out to fight the Mahometans, turned their arms against the Christian city of Constantinople, and kept possession of it for fifty-seven years, when they were expelled by the Greeks, assisted by the Genoese. While the Venetians had possession of Constantinople, they had great advantages in carrying on the Indian trade; but after they were expelled, and the Greeks recovered possession of their city, the Genoese obtained the privileges which the Venetians had possessed, and the Venetians were excluded. The Venetians then, in defiance of their religious scruples, made a treaty with the Mahometans, and obtained the produce of India through Egypt. But the discovery of a passage to India by the Cape of Good Hope, ruined for ever the trade and power of Venice.

The latter end of the sixteenth century was distinguished by a great spirit of discovery. The nations of Europe had, in preceding centuries, been engaged in foreign or domestic broils, and now they seemed to be looking abroad for other engagements. Constantinople as well as Egypt having fallen into the hands of the Mahometans, Christendom was put under contribution to the Mahometans for all the luxuries of the East. It then naturally became a matter of inquiry, whether these luxuries could be obtained through some other channel. Christopher Columbus, a Genoese, the native of a country whose commerce had been supplanted by the artifices of the Venetians, had conceived the plan of sailing to the East Indies by a new course. For many centuries it had been admitted by philosophers that the world was globular; and, if so, it was clear that you might arrive at any point by travelling westward, with as much certainty as if you travelled

eastward. Columbus having prevailed on the court of Spain to grant him two ships, sailed westward in search of India. In about thirty days he arrived at St. Domingo. He supposed he had arrived in India; and, consequently, the islands he discovered still retain the name of the West Indies, and the countries which originally bore the name of India, are now distinguished by the title of East Indies. But while Columbus was attempting, under the patronage of Spain, to discover India by sailing westward, the Portuguese admiral, Vasco de Gama, discovered the true way, by sailing south. The object of the Portuguese expedition was merely to explore the western coast of Africa. But, having arrived as far as the Cape of Good Hope, they observed some of the productions of India, and continuing their voyage, ultimately arrived at Calcutta, on the 22nd May, 1498, ten months and two days after they had left Lisbon. The Portuguese fitted out new expeditions, not merely with a view to commerce, but also to make permanent settlements in the East. For nearly a century the whole of this trade was entirely in their hands; and, notwithstanding the sovereigns of Egypt and the Venetians made every effort to frustrate their attempts, they ultimately succeeded in obtaining establishments in Asia.

We have now closed the historical portion of our Lecture, and shall add only a few observations on the principles on which the trade to India has been conducted.

The principal objection to which the Indian trade has been exposed, both in ancient and in modern times, is, that it takes from Europe a large amount of the precious metals. As the imports from India have always exceeded the exports, the balance has necessarily been paid with gold or silver bullion. But this is no objection at all. Gold and silver are nothing more than commodities. If they are found in our own soil, their exportation is no greater evil than the exportation of tin or copper, or any other metal that may be found in our mines. If they are not raised from our own soil, they must be purchased by the exportation of some other commodity. The exportation of gold and silver, therefore, is no more an evil than the exportation of those commodities with which the

gold and silver are purchased. If we sell hardware and cottons to America for gold, and send that gold to India for silks and spices, it amounts to the same thing as though we sent our hardware and cottons to India, and exchanged them directly for silks and spices.

This objection to the Indian trade arises from considering gold and silver not as commodities, but as currency. We have been accustomed to measure our wealth by the precious metals, and hence we have been led to consider them as wealth. In all languages the word "money" is used as synonymous with wealth. We say, "to get money," when we mean, "to get rich." But money is very distinct from wealth. A merchant may have his warehouses filled with goods, and have many ships on the ocean, and yet not have a hundred pounds in money. Gold is not money until it is coined, and even then the value of the coin will be regulated by its value as a commodity. You are aware that gold is coined into money in England at the Mint price of 3*l.* 17*s.* 10½*d.* per ounce. A pound weight of gold used to be coined into forty-four guineas and a half. It is now coined into forty-six sovereigns, and there is a remainder equal to 14*s.* 6*d.* 3*l.* 17*s.* 10½*d.*, multiplied by 12, the number of ounces in a pound troy, make 46*l.* 14*s* 6*d.*

Since in every age the precious metals have been sent to India, it has naturally been asked, What has become of them, as we do not find in India that abundance of gold or silver that might naturally be expected? To this inquiry the reply has been, that they are buried in the earth. The insecurity of property, arising from the despotism of the governments, and the frequent wars among the respective tribes or nations, has, from time immemorial, induced the inhabitants of all oriental countries to conceal their money by burying it in the earth. There is a prevalent opinion in the East, that the soil contains a vast amount of hidden treasure. We find, from the New Testament history, that land was sometimes purchased, in order to obtain a legal right to the treasure it contained. "The kingdom of heaven is like unto treasure hid in a field, the which, when a man hath found he hideth, and

for joy thereof goeth and selleth all that he hath and buyeth that field." We can fancy that a curious destiny may have attended a portion of ancient gold. It may have been taken from the mines of Spain in the form of ore, then smelted by the Carthaginians, and sent to Athens in payment for oil; at Athens it may have been coined into a *stater*, and stamped with the figure of Minerva. It may have been circulated among the states of Greece until it fell into the hands of a corn merchant, who sent it to Egypt in payment for corn; at Egypt, it may have been given in exchange for spices to an Arabian merchant, who may have passed it into India, where it may again have been entombed in the earth, and there remain.

The subjects we have discussed will teach us to admire the goodness of our Creator towards his creature—man. Viewed merely as an animal, his pleasures are far superior to those of any other animal; he has a greater variety of food, and of clothing, and of habitation, and of those supernumerary enjoyments which are styled luxuries. Providence might have given to man only one kind of food, one kind of clothing, and one form of habitation, and have limited his means of existence to what might be supplied by his immediate neighbourhood. But we find this is not the case. Count the various kinds of food, you will find that their number is greater than at first you would imagine; count the various articles of your dress, the materials of which it is composed, the substances used in producing the colours, and the instruments employed in the different processes it has gone through; count the materials used in the construction of your habitation, and the numberless articles of furniture it contains: then inquire into the natural history of all these substances; ask where were they produced—how they were gathered—when brought to this country—and through what preparation they passed, in order to be adapted for your use? Do all this, and you will find that the birds of the air, and the beasts of the field, and the fishes of the sea, and even the reptiles that crawl upon the earth, have been compelled to contribute to your enjoyments.

But the pleasure which man derives from these luxuries is

greatly increased by the powers of association, reflection, and reasoning, with which he is endowed. He not only enjoys the physical gratification which these objects produce on the senses, but he regards them as proofs of a Power that is omnipotent—of a Wisdom that is infinite—and of a Goodness that is boundless; and thus his animal enjoyments lead to mental and moral gratifications.

"When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers—the moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained; Lord, what is man, that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that thou visitest him? For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honour. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands: thou hast put all things under his feet; all sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field, the fowls of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the sea. He causeth the grass to grow for the cattle, and herb for the service of man, that he may bring forth food out of the earth. And wine that maketh glad the heart of man, and oil to make his face to shine, and bread which strengtheneth man's heart. How manifold are thy works, O Lord! in wisdom hast thou made them all; the earth is full of thy riches."

The retrospect we have taken of ancient commerce, will also impress us most forcibly with the powers and achievements of the human mind. Though inferior to many other animals in the greatness of his stature, in the strength of his muscles, in the acuteness of his senses, and in the fleetness of his motions, yet what does he not effect? The beasts of the field cannot resist his power, nor can the birds of the air fly beyond his reach. The valleys are clothed with verdure, and the plains abound with corn, the result of his industry; lofty mansions and splendid edifices, magnificent domes and aspiring columns rise at his command. Even the ocean, the most terrific of all the works of God, places no barrier to the exertions of man. He removes the forests from their seats—he constructs an habitation adapted to the watery element—he compels the stars to be his guide—he yokes the winds to his

car, and wafts himself to every corner of the world!—To what, but to the cultivation of his intellectual powers is man indebted for the production of these prodigious effects?

When endowed with such powers, should we not be guilty of ingratitude to the Being by whom they were bestowed, were we to neglect their cultivation? And when we see other men endowed with similar powers, should we not be deficient in wisdom and in kindness were we to refrain from supplying them with the means of improvement? In the pursuit of wealth, or honour, or power, or fame, our rivals who are engaged in the same pursuit will endeavour to impede our progress; but, in the pursuit of knowledge, all who are engaged in the same course will be anxious to accelerate our speed. And even when those objects are attained, they may suddenly be snatched from our possession; but this treasure is lodged in the mind, "where rust doth not corrupt, and where thieves cannot break through and steal." In the possession of this mental treasure lies the true honour and dignity of man:—

> "Were I so tall to reach the pole,
> And mete the ocean with a span,
> I would be measured by my soul—
> The mind's the standard of the man!"

Let us, then, while engaged in the honourable pursuit of wealth, engage at the same time, with at least equal eagerness, in the pursuit of knowledge. If Providence should smile on our exertions to obtain wealth, our intellectual attainments will enable us to enjoy that wealth with elegance and taste—to employ that wealth, so as to promote the happiness of others—to move with honour in that higher class of society to which our wealth will introduce us—and to discharge faithfully any public duties which our country's voice may call us to perform. But if, on the other hand, the winds of heaven should scatter our ships, the fire devour our storehouses, or the sons of wickedness rob us of the fruits of our industry,—still, amid the wreck of our fortunes, our intellectual and moral worth will secure the respect of those around us, and we shall have within ourselves a source of happiness more pure, more

serene, more constant than all the wealth, and all the luxuries of India can supply. "Happy is the man that findeth wisdom, and the man that getteth understanding. For the merchandise of it is better than the merchandise of silver, and the gain thereof than find gold. It cannot be valued with the gold of Ophir, with the precious onyx or the sapphire. No mention shall be made of coral or of pearls, for the price of wisdom is above rubies. Wisdom is the principal thing, therefore, get wisdom, and with all thy getting, get understanding. Exalt her, and she shall promote thee; she shall bring thee to honour when thou dost embrace her. She is more precious than rubies, and all the things thou canst desire are not to be compared unto HER." In proportion as we increase our knowledge, in proportion as we improve our mental faculties, in such proportion do we widen the distance between ourselves and the brutes, and approach that state of existence where man, in all the grandeur of unclouded reason —in all the beauty of spotless innocence—shall attain the full perfection of his character, and be conformed to the image of that Supreme Intelligence by whom our intellectual powers are bestowed.

THE SOCIAL EFFECTS

OF

THE REFORMATION.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

I.—The Supremacy of the Pope 145

II.—Monastic Institutions. 158

III.—The Usurpations of the Clergy 173

IV.—Costly Ceremonials 192

V.—Constitutional Liberty 210

THE SOCIAL EFFECTS

OF

THE REFORMATION.

THE SUPREMACY OF THE POPE.*

The Papal yoke, previous to the Reformation, was far more oppressive than it has been since. Had the Reformation never taken place, Popery would, of course, have remained the same as it had been for preceding centuries. Protestant countries, by emancipating themselves from the dominion of the Pope, have rendered that dominion less burthensome in those countries over which it is still exercised. The Popery of the present day is very injurious to the country in which it is established; but it is not so pernicious as was the Popery of former ages: for this difference we are indebted to the rise of Protestantism. I shall not now enter into a detail of all the advantages which have arisen from the Reformation in this country, but shall consider those only which we have derived from the abolition of the Papal supremacy.

1. By the abolition of the Papal supremacy, our sovereign cannot now be deposed by the mandate of the Pope.

Previous to the Reformation, the Pope was the prince of the kings of the earth. He could relieve subjects from their oath of allegiance; he could depose monarchs and give their kingdoms to whom he pleased. Our King John was

* These Essays appeared in a periodical during the years 1824 and 1825, in reply to Mr. Cobbett's History of the Reformation.

deposed, and England was given to Philip, King of France. John outwitted the King of France; for seeing his danger, he gave his kingdoms to the Pope. The Pope now threatened Philip with excommunication if he presumed to touch what belonged to the Holy See. John now retained his kingdom, on condition of paying an annual tribute of a thousand marks to the Pope. Nor was John the only victim; many other sovereigns have been deposed, or deprived, by the Popes:—

1.	Pope	Zachary I. . . .	deposed	Childerick, King of France.
2.	„	Gregory VII. .	„	Henry IV., Emperor of Germany.
3.	„	Urban II. . . .	„	Philip, King of France.
4.	„	Adrian IV. . .	„	William, King of Sicily.
5.	„	Innocent III. .	„	Philip, Emperor of Germany.
6.	„	Gregory	„	Frederick II.
7.	„	Innocent IV. .	„	John, King of England.
8.	„	Urban IV. . . .	„	Manfred, King of Sicily.
9.	„	Nicholas III. .	„	Charles, King of Sicily.
10.	„	Martin IV. . . .	„	Peter, King of Arragon.
11.	„	Boniface VIII.	deprived	Philip the Fair, King of France.
12.	„	Clement V. . .	deposed	Henry V., Emperor of Germany.
13.	„	John XXII. . .	deprived	Lodovick, Emperor of Germany.
14.	„	Gregory IX. . .	deposed	Wenceslaus, Emperor of Germany.
15.	„	Paul III.	deprived	Henry VIII., King of England.*

The Reformation, then, has given us this benefit: we are in no danger of seeing our monarch hurled from his throne, and ourselves and our property delivered over to a foreign prince, at the mere caprice of an Italian bishop. Even the excommunication of a monarch, when he was not deposed, degraded him in the estimation of his subjects. "When Robert the Second, king of the Capetian race, was most unjustly excommunicated by the court of Rome, his own servants, it is said, threw the victuals which came from his table to the dogs, and refused to taste anything themselves which had been polluted by the contact of a person in his situation."† When Geoffrey, archdeacon of Norwich, who was intrusted with a considerable office in the Court of the Exchequer, heard, whilst sitting on the bench, of the excom-

* Bennett's Memorial, p. 30.

† Smith's Wealth of Nations, vol. iv. p. 55.

munication of King John, he observed to his colleagues the danger of serving under an excommunicated king, and immediately left the court.*

2. The abolition of the Papal supremacy has delivered us from the fear of having our country placed under an interdict.

And what was an interdict? Read. "The sentence of interdict, at that time the great instrument of vengeance and policy by the court of Rome, was denounced against sovereigns for the lightest offences, and made the guilt of one person involve the ruin of millions, even in their spiritual and eternal welfare. The execution of it was calculated to strike the senses in the highest degree, and to operate with irresistible force on the superstitious minds of the people. The nation was, of a sudden, deprived of all exterior exercise of its religion. The altars were spoiled of their ornaments. The crosses, the relics, the images, the statues of the saints were laid on the ground; and as if the air itself were profaned, and might pollute them by its contact, the priests carefully covered them up, even from their own approach and veneration. The use of bells entirely ceased in all the churches. The bells themselves were removed from their steeples, and laid on the ground with the other sacred utensils. Mass was celebrated with shut doors, and none but the priests were admitted to that holy institution. The laity partook of no religious rite, except baptism to new-born infants, and the communion to the dying; the dead were not interred in consecrated ground; they were thrown into ditches, or buried in common fields; and their obsequies were not attended with prayers, or any hallowed ceremony. Marriage was celebrated in the churchyards; and that every action in life might bear the marks of this dreadful situation, the people were prohibited the use of meat, as in Lent, or times of the highest penance; were debarred from all pleasures and entertainments, or even to salute each other, or so much as to shave their beards, and give any decent attention to their person and apparel."†

* Hume, vol. i. p. 188. Stereotype edition.

† Ib. vol. i. p. 187.

3. The abolition of the Papal supremacy has delivered every individual from the danger of an excommunication. "Well," some one will exclaim, "of what importance is that? Who would care about an excommunication?" Nay, my friend, before the Reformation this was no trifing matter. A sentence of excommunication deprived a man of nearly all his civil privileges. He could not receive the sacrament,* nor even enter a church. He could not bring an action at law—might not be presented to a benefice. He could not be either an advocate or a witness; nor was he allowed to make a will, nor to have Christian burial. This dreadful sentence was inflicted for the most trifling offences. Were a man even to hold intercourse with an excommunicated person, he was liable to be excommunicated himself. When the kingdom was placed under an interdict, a man might have the consolation of seeing that all his neighbours were as badly off as himself; but here he had to bear all the burthen alone.

4. The abolition of the Papal supremacy has prevented England being engaged in any wars to support the dignity of the Holy See.

Instigated by the Popes, all the Christian princes of Europe squandered immense sums of money, and lost an immense number of men in crusades to the Holy Land. If these expeditions were ultimately beneficial to Europe, by cutting off some hundreds of turbulent barons, and by opening a commercial intercourse with the East, it was a consequence neither designed nor anticipated. But besides these crusades to the Holy Land, the Popes beat up crusades against the Albigenses, crusades against the Moors, crusades against the Bohemians; and sometimes, for want of better amusement, they set the Catholic princes crusading against one another. These dutiful sons of the church had no objection to enrich themselves at the expense of their neighbours; and if it were necessary to the accomplishment of these pious objects, that they should employ, now and then, a little injustice, a little treachery, or a little perjury,

* Burn's Ecclesiastical Law, vol. ii. p. 210.

the Holy Father could easily absolve them from it all; he could release them from the most solemn treaties, and pardon the most atrocious crimes. At the instigation of the Pope, our Henry III. engaged in a war for the conquest of Sicily, by which he ruined his finances, and incurred a debt of above one hundred and thirty-five thousand marks.* The contributions towards pious objects of this description were often enormous. At the times of the crusades, besides the money spent by the crusades, they who tarried at home submitted at first to a property tax, and afterwards to the saladine tythe, which alone amounted to a sum equal to two millions sterling of modern money.† From how many wars of this kind Europe has been delivered by the Reformation it is impossible to ascertain. We have had wars enough, it is true, since the Reformation, and so we should have had if the Reformation had never taken place; but, at all events, we have one cause of war less now than we had before.

5. The abolition of the Papal supremacy has deprived the Pope of the presentation to church-livings.

No subject was the occasion of so much contest between the Pope and the different princes of Europe as this. In these contests the Pope, with the assistance of the clergy, was generally successful. "But no sooner was this point, after a great effusion of blood, and the convulsion of many states, established in some tolerable degree, than the victorious leader, as is usual, turned his arms against his own community, and aspired to centre all power in his person. By the invention of reserves, provisions, commendams, and other devices, the Pope gradually assumed the right of filling vacant benefices; and the plenitude of his apostolic power, which was not subject to any limitations, supplied all defects of title in the person on whom he bestowed preferment."‡

For presuming to present to vacant benefices, Henry IV., of Germany, though "an emperor distinguished not only for many virtues, but possessed of considerable talents, was at

* Hume, vol. i. p. 224.

† Sinclair's History of the Revenue, vol. i. p. 89.

‡ Hume, vol. i. p. 185.

length obliged to appear as a suppliant at the gate of the castle in which the Pope resided; and to stand there three days barefooted in the depth of winter, imploring a pardon, which at length he obtained with difficulty."*

"In Spain the Popes formerly nominated to all benefices, and to all ecclesiastical dignities, if they became vacant in the months of January, February, April, May, July, August, October, and November; they also nominated at all times, and to all benefices, the possessors of which happened to die at Rome. They had also claims on every benefice for expectatives, reserves, and indults; they also enjoyed the revenues of all consistorial benefices during their vacancy; they levied annats, and half annats on all benefices; they received fifteenths on all benefices attached to universities, colleges, seminaries, and hospitals, and all other corporations in mortmain; finally, they gave bulls for all benefices within ecclesiastical patronage which became vacant during any of the eight reserved months."† The Pope enjoyed all these good things till the year 1753; and had the Reformation never taken place in other countries, he would probably retain them still; but he was then compelled to relinquish them, though he still retains, among other privileges, the nomination to fifty-two of the best benefices in the kingdom.

In England "the Holy Father reserved to himself, by his own apostolical authority, the presentation to all benefices which became vacant, while the incumbent was attending the court of Rome, upon any occasion, or on his journey thither or back again; and moreover such also as became vacant by his promotion to a bishopric or abbey."‡ "The very nomination to bishoprics, that ancient prerogative of the crown, was wrested from King Henry I., and afterwards from his successor king John, and seemingly, indeed, conferred on the chapters belonging to each see; but by means of the frequent appeals to Rome, through the intricacy of the laws which regulated canonical elections, was eventually

* Robertson's Charles the Fifth, vol. i. p. 135.

† Laborde's View of Spain.

‡ Blackstone's Commentaries, vol. iv. p. 107.

vested in the Pope." Had all the persons nominated by the Pope been Englishmen, and had they lived and spent their revenues in England, it would have been bad enough; but this was not the case. "The best livings were filled by Italian and other foreign clergy, equally unskilled in and averse to the laws and constitution of England."* Nor was this all: many of these Italians never came to England. They received their revenues, it is true; but they knew no more of England, except from the testimony of others, than they did of the domains in the moon. Henry III. and the nobility of England complained to the Pope, Innocent IV. They represented, among many other grievances, that the benefices of the Italian clergy in England had been estimated, "and were found to amount to 60,000 marks a year, *a sum which exceeded the annual revenue of the crown itself.*"† The Reformation has thus saved us all the money which would otherwise be sent to the cardinals, and other ecclesiastics of Rome, who might happen to hold English bishoprics. How then is England impoverished by the Reformation?

6. The abolition of the Papal supremacy abolished all appeals to the Pope in judicial cases.

The ecclesiastical court in England took cognizance of all cases of marriage, divorce, legitimacy, vows, oaths, wills, and all things connected with benefices. From the decision of this court, an appeal might be made to the tribunal of the Pope in Italy. We know what inconvenience and expense people are often put to, by being compelled to attend a law-suit in London; but how greatly would the expense and inconvenience be increased if, after having obtained a decision in London, either party might appeal to the Pope, and thus compel his opponent to take a voyage to Italy. These appeals gave importance and influence to the Pope, and caused much money to be spent in his dominions; but the chief advantage he derived from them was, the power they gave him over church-livings: when a benefice became vacant, nothing was easier than to raise a law-suit about

* Blackstone's Commentaries, vol. iv. p. 108.

† Hume, vol. i. p. 223.

the presentation; and as the Pope was the judge, he might give the living to which party he pleased. This was done in a manner the most iniquitous and shameful. "The canons which regulated elections were purposely rendered intricate, and frequent disputes arose among candidates; appeals were every day carried to Rome; the apostolic see, besides reaping pecuniary advantages from these contests, often exercised the power of setting aside both the litigants; and on pretence of appeasing faction, nominated a third person, who might be more acceptable to the contending parties."* So much for the justice of the tribunal of the Pope.

7. By the abolition of the Papal supremacy, England saved all the money which would otherwise be sent out of the kingdom for first-fruits and tenths.

Whenever an ecclesiastic was put in possession of a benefice, all his revenue for the first year was given to the Pope. This was called the first-fruits. But besides this, the Pope had a tenth part of the revenue of every subsequent year. That I may not be charged with exaggeration, I will suppose that, one with another, all the church-livings in England became vacant once every ten years. Let us take a living of one hundred pounds a year: the whole revenue of this living for ten years will be one thousand pounds; the Pope has the first year's revenue, which is one hundred pounds, and the tenth part of a hundred for each of the following nine years; so we find, that out of the one thousand pounds received, one hundred and ninety pounds, or nearly one fifth, went to the Pope. These tenths and first-fruits were levied on every benefice in England, and the money sent annually to Rome. How then is England impoverished by the Reformation?

8. The abolition of the Papal supremacy has saved to England the expense of dispensations and indulgences.

Dispensations were granted on many occasions: dispensations from oaths, from vows, from the observance of religious rites. If a sick man were sure that an abstinence from meat, during Lent, would cause his death, he dared not touch it

* Hume, vol. i. p. 185.

without paying the Pope for a dispensation. But, perhaps, the most oppressive, and, in some cases, the most iniquitous of all these dispensations were those which regarded marriage. Marriages were prohibited within the seventh degree of relationship. Nay, more—there were spiritual relationships. If, for instance, two men stood as godfathers to the same child, they became spiritual brothers, and their children spiritual first cousins, and consequently no marriages could take place between the members of their respective families. But the object of these prohibitions was not to prevent the marriages, but to get money by selling the dispensations. There was no difficulty in getting this, if the parties could raise the money. A few years ago, a man in Canada wished to marry his first cousin; the priest demanded one hundred and fifty dollars for the dispensation. All the property the man had in the world was not worth more than sixty dollars, and this sum he was willing to give; and he declared that if the priest would not marry him, he would go to the Protestant clergyman, who would marry him for three or four dollars. The priest was afraid of losing both the man and the money; and after writing to the bishop, agreed to take the sixty dollars."*

Indulgences were another tax imposed by the Pope. Their nature is too well known to need explanation. A list of the Pope's fees in these cases was given in a book published about two hundred years ago, by the authority of the then Pope. It has been translated into English, under the title of "Rome a great Custom-House for Sin." The following are extracts:

Absolutions.—For a priest that keeps a concubine, 10*s.* 6*d.* —For him that burns his neighbour's house, 12*s.*—For him that forgeth the Pope's hand, 1*l.* 7*s.*—For him that taketh two holy orders in one day, 2*l.* 6*s.*—For a king for going to the holy sepulchre without licence, 7*l.* 10*s.*—For him that killeth his father, mother, wife, or sister, 10*s.* 6*d.*—For him that stole consecrated things out of a holy place, 10*s.* 6*d.*—For a layman for murdering a layman, 7*s.* 6*d.*

Dispensations.—For a bastard to enter all holy orders, 18*s.*

* Lambert's Travels through Lower Canada, vol. i. p. 359.

—For a man or woman that is found hanged, that they may have Christian burial, 1*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Licences.—To eat flesh in times prohibited, 1*l.* 4*s.*—To marry in times prohibited, 2*l.* 5*s.*—For a town to take out of a church them (murderers) that have taken sanctuary there, 4*l.* 10*s.*—That a king or queen shall enjoy such indulgences as if they went to Rome, 15*l.*—For a queen to adopt a child, 300*l.*"

In the time of Queen Elizabeth, the English captured a Spanish ship that contained two millions of bulls of indulgences, which had cost the King of Spain three hundred thousand florins, and would have been sold by him in the Indies for five millions.*

9. By the abolition of the Papal supremacy, England has saved the expenses of relics and other consecrated articles that used to be imported from Rome, and also the expense of other impositions and exactions of foreign monks. To enumerate these would be endless: there were, Agnus Dei's, crosses, pictures, bits of wood, of bone, and of cloth, all of which were alleged to have a miracle-working power: most of these had received the benediction and the sanction of the Pope. But his Holiness took care to be paid for all this. Many relics were purchased at Rome, and brought over here by the friars. Others, though of native growth, had received his sanction, on the payment of certain fees. Canonization, or the making of saints, could be obtained only from the Pope, and it cost so much money, that though our Henry VII. wished to have one of his female relations canonized, he declined it, in consideration of the expense.† Besides this, I might mention the collections often made by travelling monks and mendicant friars, in behalf of the holy sepulchre, and other foreign objects. The contributions in these cases were certainly voluntary; that is, as voluntary as an act can be which is produced by the threat of eternal damnation; but still the money was taken out of the kingdom. Money was also taken from the country by the alien priories which were connected with monasteries at Rome, or other places

* Hume, vol. ii. p. 75. † Henry's History of England, vol. xii.

abroad, but were endowed with lands in England. Each of those orders of monks, too, who lived in England, might be taxed by the general of the order, who usually lived in Italy. The money was thus raised in this country, and sent to Rome, and was mostly applied to the service of the Pope.

10. The abolition of the Papal supremacy has saved the country all the money which would otherwise be expended in pilgrimages to Rome.

The Popes have always been exceedingly anxious to induce the faithful to visit Rome. Their capital, by this means, had greater importance in the estimation of other nations, and the ecclesiastical states became enriched by the money spent by foreigners. For this purpose they adorned their Italian churches with the finest works of art, and established festivals and processions of the most imposing form. But the chief means employed were the relics and the indulgences. Almost every church in the Papal dominions had a bit of bone, a bit of wood, or a bit of cloth which is alleged to be the relic of some miracle-working saint. Many motives induced the faithful to visit these sacred places. Some to be relieved from diseases, some to perform vows which they had made in sickness, and others to make atonement for some atrocious sins. The Popes, finding these pilgrimages greatly enriched the Holy See, established a year of jubilee, during which all who should visit certain churches in the papal dominions should have a plenary remission of all their sins. By getting a great number of people in Italy at the same time, the price of provisions and accommodations would be increased, and thus more money would be spent. And then, only think of a remission of all our sins! who would not go to Italy for that? These jubilees were found to be such good things, that though at first it was decreed that the jubilee should occur only once in every hundred years, yet now it is once in every twenty-five years. Oh, if England had now been Popish, what a number of rich sinners should we see journeying away to Italy, to make atonement for their sins, by spending the wealth of England on the monks of Rome! By these pilgrimages, the churches of Italy soon

became possessed of enormous treasures. Among the chief of these was the Holy House at Loretta. This building, the papists gravely assure us, is the very house in which the angel appeared to the Virgin, and in which Joseph and Mary continued to live after their return from Egypt. Lest it should fall into the hands of the Turks, the angels brought it from Nazareth, and ultimately fixed it in Loretta. In this church * a miraculous image, a porringer out of which Christ used to eat when he was a child, and a gown of his mother's, are exhibited. "The pilgrims that resort to this place between Easter and Whitsuntide were reckoned, in some years, to amount to five or six hundred thousand. And at the beginning of September, when the feast of the Virgin's nativity is celebrated, no less than a hundred thousand are said to have arrived in one day. The inhabitants of Loretta get a pretty livelihood by making strings of beads, images of the Virgin, Agnus Dei's, &c., with which they furnish the pilgrims, who lay out most of their money in trinkets of this nature."† "The riches in the Holy House and treasury," says Mr. Addison, "are surprisingly great, and as far surpassed my expectation as other sights have generally fallen short of it. Silver can scarce find an admission, and gold itself looks but poorly among such an incredible number of precious stones. There will be, in a few ages more, the jewels of the greatest value in Europe, if the devotion of its princes continues in its present fervour. The last offering was made by the queen dowager of Poland, and cost her eighteen thousand crowns."‡

11. The abolition of the Papal supremacy has saved this country from a variety of other pecuniary impositions. The first of these was St. Peter's pence. This was a tax of a penny on each house; and at the time of the Reformation, it amounted to about seven thousand five hundred pounds a year. But I can particularize no further. The extortions of the Pope were unbounded. Besides the regular taxes of the Holy See, an act of parliament, passed in the reign of Henry VIII.,

* Stolberg's Travels, vol. iv. p. 445.

† Thomson's Travels, vol. i. p. 203. ‡ Addison's Remarks on Italy.

states, that the Pope derived money by "pensions, censes, procurations, suits for provisions, and expeditions of bulls; for archbishopricks, and bishopricks, and for delegacies, and the receipts in causes of contentions and appeals, jurisdictions, legantine, dispensations, licences, faculties, grants, relaxations, abolitions, and infinite sorts of bulls, brieves, and instruments of sundry natures, names, and kinds, *to the great decay and impoverishment of the kingdom.*"*

The above may, perhaps, be considered as the established revenues or fees of the Holy See; but, besides these, there were extraordinary calls for money. The Popes claimed the privilege of taxing the clergy as they pleased; and employed various pretences to get money both from them and from the laity. Pope Innocent IV. "exacted the revenues of all vacant benefices, the twentieth of all ecclesiastical revenues without exception, the third of such as exceeded a hundred marks a year, and the half of such as were possessed by non-residents. He claimed the goods of all intestate clergymen; he pretended a title to inherit all money gotten by usury; he levied benevolences upon the people; and when the king (Henry III.), contrary to his usual practice, prohibited these exactions, he threatened to pronounce against him the same censures which he had emitted against the Emperor Frederic."† The Bishop of Hereford, who resided at Rome, drew bills for the service of the Pope on the clergy of England for 150,540 marks, which they were afterwards compelled to pay.‡ "In the year 1240, the legate having in vain attempted the clergy in a body, obtained separately by intrigues and menaces, large sums from the prelates and convents, and on his departure is said to have carried more money out of the kingdom than he left in it. This experiment was renewed four years after, with success, by Martin the Nuncio, who brought from Rome powers of suspending and excommunicating all clergymen that refused to comply with his demands."§ From all these extortions the Refor-

* Sinclair's History of the Revenue, vol. i. p. 57.

† Hume, vol. i. p. 224.

‡ Ib. p. 225. § Ib. p. 223.

mation has delivered us. How then is England impoverished by the Reformation?

What was the total amount of the Papal exactions in this kingdom it is impossible to state, but it must have been enormous; and when we take into consideration the alteration in the value of money, in consequence of the discovery of America, it will appear almost incredible. Our fathers groaned under it as a most oppressive burden. In the time of Edward III. the parliament (a Popish parliament, mind) declared that the taxes levied by the Pope *exceeded five times those which were paid to the king.**

MONASTIC INSTITUTIONS.

In the present article I shall attempt to show the pernicious effects of monastic institutions, and shall point out the different ways in which they are detrimental to national prosperity.

1. Monastic institutions deprive a country of the labour of a great number of useful hands.

Idleness, in regard to a nation as well as in regard to an individual, produces poverty and wretchedness. National wealth is produced by national labour; and in proportion to the number of persons who are idle, in such proportion is the nation impoverished. All history bears testimony to the laziness of the monks: both their virtues and their vices tended to produce this effect. Whether they were employed in repeating their prayers before a crucifix, or in fabricating legends to deceive the people, they contributed nothing to the sum of national labour. The number of these idle drones was prodigious. The monasteries of this country, at the time of their suppression by Henry VIII., contained no less than fifty thousand persons.† Now, will any one seriously contend that these fifty thousand people would not have been more useful to their country if they had been employed in culti-

* Hume, vol. i. p. 335.

† Burn's Ecclesiastical Law, vol. ii. p. 478.

vating the land, in making roads and bridges, in building houses, and establishing manufactories? Are we to be told that a carpenter or a smith does not render more service to his country than a monk? Let us suppose that, according to the present value of money, these fifty thousand people might earn, one with another, a shilling a day, and that there are three hundred working days in the year; then was there a yearly loss to the country of seven hundred and fifty thousand pounds.

At the time these monasteries were suppressed, the population of this country was four millions and a half,* and consequently the monks and nuns were one-ninetieth part of the population. But as they were all grown-up men and women, they formed one forty-fifth part of the adults. Thus, to twelve millions of population, if we had monks and nuns in the same proportion in which they abounded in the time of Henry VIII., we should have no fewer of these gentry than one hundred and thirty-three thousand.† This appears astounding; but in fact there was a much larger number in France previous to the Revolution. Now, will it be said that the Reformation has impoverished the country, when it has set all these people at work, when it has allowed them to marry and have families, and has thus furnished a fresh motive to industry, and produced additional hands to contribute to the stock of national wealth?

"Henry VIII., resolving to reform the church of England, ruined the monks, of themselves a lazy set of people, that encouraged laziness in others; because as they practised hospitality, an infinite number of idle persons, gentlemen and citizens, spent their lives in running from convent to convent. He demolished even the hospitals, in which the lower people found subsistence, as the gentlemen did theirs in the monasteries. Since these changes, the spirit of trade and industry has been established in England."‡

* The population of England and Wales, by the census of 1861, was 20,066,224.

† Chalmers' Estimate of the Comparative Strength of Great Britain, p. 38.

‡ Montesquieu's Spirit of Laws.

"Which great event (the Reformation) has proved very beneficial to those particular countries wherein Protestantism has been firmly established, since by suppressing the idle drones in the convents, and putting a stop to the great sums annually remitted to Rome, and carried to other parts for pilgrimages, &c., their people are more increased, and more profitably employed for the general benefit, while their money, before so unworthily dissipated, is now employed in trade and commerce."*

2. Monastic institutions consumed a large portion of the national wealth.

Had those persons who entered the monasteries been carried off by a pestilence, or fallen in the field of battle, the country would have lost their services, and there would have been an end of the mischief; but when they entered the monasteries, they became burthensome to the industrious part of the community. Though they would not work, they could eat, nor was it a little that would satisfy their wants. The revenues of the monks were derived mainly from four sources—first, their endowments in land; secondly, the church livings which they held; thirdly, their fees for ecclesiastical services; and fourthly, the voluntary offerings of pious devotees. Their lands were ample. At the time of the suppression by Henry, it was estimated that the monks possessed one-twentieth part of the land of the whole kingdom."† This valuation of their lands being made by persons who intended to purchase them, was much too low. "It appears, from an account drawn up anno 1717, that the annual income of the houses suppressed by Henry must have then amounted to 273,000*l.*: and at a moderate computation, would now yield at least six millions per annum. The Abbey of St. Alban's, which was valued only at 2,500*l.* per annum, possessed estates which, a century after the suppression, brought in 200,000*l.* a year."‡ "The monks were formerly much at their ease in England. We read of the Abbey of Chertsey, in Surrey, which possessed

* Anderson's History of Commerce, vol. ii. p. 34.

† Hume's England, vol. i. p. 558.

‡ Sir John Sinclair's History of the Public Revenue, vol. i. p. 184.

744*l.* a year, though it contained only fourteen monks; that of Furmese, in the county of Lincoln, was valued at 960*l.* a year, and contained about thirty.*

"Another engine set on foot, or at least greatly improved by the court of Rome, was a masterpiece of papal policy. Not content with the ample provision of tithes, which the law of the land had given to the parochial clergy, they endeavoured to grasp at the lands and inheritances of the kingdom, and, had not the Legislature withstood them, would by this time have probably been masters of every foot of ground in the kingdom. To this end they introduced the monks of the Benedictine and other rules, men of sour and austere religion, separated from the world and its concerns by a vow of perpetual celibacy, yet who fascinated the minds of the people by pretences to extraordinary sanctity, while all their aim was to aggrandize the power and extend the influence of their grand superior, the Pope. And as in those times of civil tumult, great rapines and violence were daily committed by overgrown lords and their adherents, they were taught to believe, that founding a monastery a little before their deaths would atone for a life of incontinence, disorder, and bloodshed. Hence innumerable abbeys and religious houses were built within a century after the Conquest, and endowed, not only with the tithes of parishes, which were ravished from the secular clergy, but also with lands, manors, lordships, and extensive baronies. And the doctrine inculcated was, that whatever was so given to, or purchased by the monks and friars, was consecrated to God himself, and that to alienate, or take it away, was no less than the sin of sacrilege.

"But when these donations began to grow numerous, it was observed, that the feudal services ordained for the defence of the kingdom were every day visibly withdrawn, that the circulation of landed property from man to man began to stagnate, and that the lords were curtailed of the fruits of their signiories, their escheats, wardships, reliefs, and the like, and therefore, in order to prevent this, it was ordained,

* Hume's England, vol. i. p. 559.

by the second of King Henry III.'s great charter, and afterwards by that printed in our common statute book, that all such attempts should be void, and the land forfeited to the lord of the fee.*

Monastic institutions were exceedingly injurious to the secular clergy. In the first place, the lands of the monasteries paid no tithes. The monks possessed, too, as I have stated, ecclesiastical fees and church livings. Though the performance of ecclesiastical services was an infringement of the privileges of the secular clergy, yet, as in this case the monks did the work, it seemed proper enough that they should have the pay. But the acquisition of church livings was a most iniquitous measure. The revenues of several wealthy livings were settled on a monastery, and the monks hired some poor brothers, at a low salary, to do the work. Now, I am very willing to admit, as I shall show by-and-by, that the secular clergy had enormous wealth; but though the secular clergy, as a body, were overpaid for their work, that is no reason why individuals among them should have their revenues taken away, and given to monks who did no work at all.

Of the voluntary offerings no calculation can be made. The religious of each monastery were for ever exposing new relics, and attesting new miracles, in order to attract the unhealthy, the penitent, and the pilgrim, all of whom were expected to present an offering to the miracle-working saints, that is, to the monks themselves. The offerings at the shrine of St. Thomas à Becket amounted in one year to nine hundred and fifty-four pounds six shillings and three-pence.† "The jewels, plate, furniture, and other goods which had belonged to all these houses, must have amounted to a prodigious sum, of which no computation can now be made. In many of the rich monasteries, their vestments were of cloth of gold, silk, and velvet, richly embroidered; their crucifixes, images, candlesticks, and other utensils, and

* Blackstone's Commentaries on the Laws of England, vol. ii. p. 269; vol. iv. p. 108.

† Hume, vol. i. p. 558.

ornaments of their churches were of gold, silver-gilt, and silver. The gold taken from the shrine of Thomas à Becket, at Canterbury, filled, it is said, two chests, which eight strong men could hardly carry."*

To increase their wealth, the monks had a variety of relics, whose virtues were adapted to all the contingencies of human life. The suppressed convents contained the "parings of St. Edmond's toes; some of the coals that roasted St. Laurence; the girdle of the Virgin, shown in eleven several places; two or three heads of St. Ursula; the felt of St. Thomas of Lancaster, an infallible cure for the headache; part of St. Thomas of Canterbury's shirt, much reverenced by big-bellied women; some relics, and an excellent preventive against rain; others, a remedy to weeds in corn."† To us Protestants these things appear so absurd that we should hardly be able to give them credit did we not know that similar absurdities exist in Catholic countries at the present day. Monsieur Dupaty, president of the parliament of Bourdeaux, who travelled through Italy in 1785, relates the following instance of the imposition of the monks on the credulity of the people of Rome:—"This morning, as I was passing quietly along the streets on my way to the capitol, I met a coach, in which were two Recollet friars, the one seated backwards, the other forwards, holding between their legs something I could not distinguish. Everybody stopped, and saluted with profound respect. I asked to whom this reverence was addressed. 'It is,' answered one of the standers by, 'to the Bambino, which these good fathers are carrying to a prelate who is very ill, and given over by his physicians.' I afterwards procured an explanation what this Bambino was. The Bambino is a little wooden Jesus, richly dressed. The convent which has the good fortune to possess this image, neither has nor needs any other patrimony. As soon as any person is seriously ill, they send for the Bambino, and always in a coach, for he never goes on foot: two Recollets conduct and place him by the sick man, where they remain at his expense, until he be either dead or recovers. The Bambino is constantly running

* Henry's History of England, vol. xii. p 70. † Hume, vol. i. p. 557.

about; they sometimes fight who shall have him at the gate of the convent, and tear him from each other. In the summer, especially, he has extraordinary business, though he makes them pay dearer for his visits, on account of the demand and the hot weather: this is but fair."—(p. 143.)

3. Monastic institutions are productive of poverty and wretchedness among the lower orders of society. The monks extorted the property of the people by appealing to their benevolence: they pretended it was all for the benefit of the poor. But it is easy to show that these institutions increase the poverty they are designed to relieve. At an early period of their existence, it was observed that the monks, for the benefit of the poor, had reduced a great part of mankind to a state of beggary.* I will explain it in this way: Suppose I pay a certain sum of money every day to my workmen: the wages of each shall be five shillings a day. I make a profit of their labour; for every five shillings, I get six. My property is thus increased. I can employ more workmen. This demand for labour raises its value. I give my men better wages; they are industrious and comfortable, and I am getting rich. But suppose, instead of paying wages to my men, I had given them five shillings a day for doing nothing. Here, it is evident, I am so much poorer, and they are idle. But as soon as it is known that I give these men five shillings a day for doing nothing, other men will leave their work, and try to share this privilege. My doors will be thronged by more men than I have money to supply. I must reduce my bounty to four shillings each. The next day the applicants will be more numerous. I can give only three shillings to each. As their numbers increase, my alms to each must be reduced, till eventually I shall be able to give them but a mere trifle a piece, and many will be obliged to go without anything. Now, then, I am so much poorer by all the money I have given away. These men endure a miserable existence, and having lost their habits of industry, they will prefer a wretched subsistence on the charity of others to a happy competence acquired by their own labour; and even were

* Gibbon's Rome, vol. iv. p. 395

they disposed to work, I have not capital to employ them. Just so is the operation of monasteries. The monks themselves are maintained in idleness, and often in luxury. The money which the ill-judged liberality of others enables them to distribute to the poor, destroys the spirit of industry and of independence. Nay, many of the monks themselves are beggars by profession. The most considerable orders of monks, before the Reformation, were the Franciscans and the Dominicans. Both of these were mendicant orders; and though they found means of eluding their vow of poverty, they still continued to beg. No wonder there are so many beggars in Catholic countries, when begging is sanctioned by the example of the teachers of religion.

This reasoning is borne out by matters of fact. In an act of parliament, passed in the third year of Henry VIII., which was long before the abolition of the monasteries, it is asserted that the prisoners in the kingdom for debts and crimes were sixty thousand persons and above.* Harrison asserts that seventy-two thousand criminals were executed during this reign. On the suppression of the monasteries, the number of robbers increased. This is a decisive proof that the monasteries must have maintained many able-bodied men in idleness and beggary.

I will also appeal to the Catholic countries of the present times. Monsieur Dupaty, in his Letters on Italy, speaks thus: "The nobility of Genoa are so well versed in the art of bestowing injudiciously, that the State is impoverished by their donations. They make mendicity a thriving trade; not a beggar at Genoa but is sure of eating and drinking every day; the artisan is not so sure of it."—(p. 42.) "There is such an abundance of alms, that it swarms with beggars."—(p. 53.) "At Lucca you are besieged by beggars."—(p. 64.) "Mendicity has stronger and deeper roots in Tuscany than anywhere else; they spread and fasten themselves under the altars."—(p. 77.) "There are more beggars at Rome than anywhere; they swarm on all sides."—(p. 258.) "Mendicity here is a certain profession."—(p. 257.) "But already

* Hume, vol. i. p. 591.

I perceive Salerno. To whom does that beautiful house, situated on the top of yonder hill, belong? To monks. And that on the declivity? To monks. And that other on the foot of yon eminence? To monks. The monks, then, possess all Salerno. There are so many convents in the town, that there is not a single vessel in the harbour. Wretched city, devoured by white, black, grey, and red insects, by caterpillars of every colour; every house swarms with them." —(p. 321.)

At Naples there are thirty thousand lazzaroni—beggars who are as poor as Lazarus. In Spain and Portugal mendicants abound, and so they did in France before the Revolution; but it is unnecessary to multiply quotations, when the facts are too notorious to be disputed.

4. Monastic institutions were the principal means of supporting and extending in this country the dominion of the Pope.

It will be admitted, by most English Catholics of the present day, that the power formerly exercised by the popes was most tyrannical and injurious. I have already pointed out some of the means which were employed to drain this country of its wealth. Though the secular clergy were sufficiently obsequious to the wishes of the pontiff, they were far surpassed by the monks. The monks had a less intimate connection with the civil power, and were more dependent on the Holy See. The Pope might suppress their order whenever he pleased! They received from Rome dispensations and indulgences and relics, which they sold to the people at a profit for themselves. Nor could their property, any more than that of the secular clergy, be taxed by the king without the consent of the Pope. The people who were fed at the monasteries were devoted to the monks, the monks were devoted to the Pope, and hence the Pope could disturb the peace, or resist the monarchs of any country in which monasteries were established. The suppression of even the lesser monasteries by Henry the Eighth produced a rebellion, which was excited and headed by the monks. The language of Adam Smith, in regard to the popish clergy generally, is

in a still higher degree applicable to the monks. "The clergy of all the different countries in Europe were thus formed into a sort of spiritual army, dispersed in different quarters indeed, but of which all the movements and operations could now be directed by one hand, and conducted upon one uniform plan. The clergy of each particular country might be considered as a particular detachment of that army, of which the operations could easily be supported and seconded by all the other detachments, quartered in the different countries round about. Each detachment was not only independent of the sovereign of the country in which it was quartered, and by which it was maintained, but dependent on a foreign sovereign, who could at any time turn its arms against the sovereign of that particular country, and support them by the arms of all the other detachments."*

"The great increase of monasteries, if matters be considered merely in a political light, will appear the radical inconvenience of the Catholic religion; and every other disadvantage attending that communion, seems to have an inseparable connection with these religious institutions: papal usurpations, the tyranny of the Inquisition, the multiplicity of holidays, all these fetters on liberty and industry were ultimately derived from the authority and insinuation of monks, whose habitations being established everywhere, proved so many seminaries of superstition and folly."†

I have said nothing of the influence of monastic institutions on the public morals. But few words are sufficient to prove, that immorality diminishes national wealth, and but little research is necessary to show that every age has cried out against the morals of the monks. Not Protestants, mind, not Protestants, but Papists, raised these clamours.‡ "In the reign of Henry the Seventh, Pope Innocent the Eighth issued a bull to reform the manners of the monks in England. In obedience to this bull, the Primate, archbishop Morton, sent admonitory letters to the superiors of all the convents and

* Wealth of Nations, vol. iv. p. 49.

† Hume's History of England, vol. i. p. 546, ch. xxxi.

‡ Henry's History of England, vol. xii. p. 4.

religious houses in his province. The monitory letter that was sent on this occasion to the Abbot of St. Alban's, has been published:—'You are infamous' (says he to the Abbot) 'for simony, usury, and squandering away the possessions of your monastery; besides other enormous crimes mentioned below.' One of the crimes was, that he had turned all the modest women out of the two nunneries of Pray and Sapwell (over which he pretended to have a jurisdiction), and filled them with prostitutes; that they were esteemed no better than brothels, and that he and his monks publicly frequented them as such. His grace seems to have been well informed, for he names some of these infamous women and their gallants. The monks were at least as profligate as their abbot; for besides keeping concubines both within and without the monastery, he accuses them of stealing the church-plate and jewels, and even of picking the jewels out of the shrine of their patron, St. Alban. Some of the old abbots and friars did not attempt to conceal their amours, which they knew to be impossible. The holy father, the prior of Maiden Bradley, assured the visitors, that he had only married six of his sons, and one of his daughters out of the goods of the priory as yet; but that several more of his children were now grown up, and would soon be marriageable. He produced a dispensation from the Pope, permitting him to keep a mistress; and he acquainted them that he took none but young maidens to be his mistresses, the handsomest that he could procure, and that when he was disposed to change, he got them good husbands."*

Hence it is evident, that monastic institutions "degraded and impoverished the main body of the people in this country;" and the Reformation, by abolishing these establishments, has elevated and enriched us: it has increased the sum of national industry by the addition of a great number of useful hands: it has circulated among the community an immense mass of property which was previously devoted to the purposes of idleness and profligacy: it has delivered the secular, that is, the working clergy from the exactions of

* Henry's History of England, vol. xii. p. 57.

hungry monks: it has given habits of industry and prudence to the lower classes of society; and finally, it has delivered the country from the extortions and the tyranny of the Roman pontiff.

5. I shall now confirm the preceding statements by a reference to the effects of monastic institutions in other countries.

"The monasteries were filled by a crowd of obscure and abject plebeians, who gained in the cloister more than they had sacrificed in the world. Peasants, slaves, and mechanics might escape from poverty and contempt, to a safe and honourable profession, whose apparent hardships were mitigated by custom, by popular applause, and by the secret relaxation of discipline. The subjects of Rome, whose persons and fortunes were made responsible for unequal and exorbitant tributes, retired from the oppression of the imperial government, and the pusillanimous youth preferred the penance of a monastic to the dangers of a military life. The affrighted provincials of every rank who fled before the barbarians, found shelter and subsistence, whole legions were buried in these religious sanctuaries, and the same cause which relieved the distress of individuals, impaired the strength and fortitude of the empire.

"The novice was tempted to bestow his fortune on the saints, in whose society he was resolved to spend the remainder of his life; and the pernicious indulgence of the laws permitted him to receive for their use any future accessions of legacy or inheritance. Time continually increased, and accidents could seldom diminish the estates of the popular monasteries, which spread over the adjacent countries and cities; and in the first century of their institution, the infidel Zosimus has maliciously observed, that for the benefit of the poor, the Christian monks had reduced a great part of mankind to a state of beggary. As long as they maintained their original fervour, they approved themselves, however, the faithful and benevolent stewards of the charity which was intrusted to their care. But their discipline was corrupted by prosperity; they gradually assumed the pride of wealth, and at last indulged the luxury of expense. Every age of

the Church has accused the licentiousness of the degenerate monks, who no longer remembered the object of their institution, embraced the vain and sensual pleasures of the world, which they had renounced, and scandalously abused the riches which had been acquired by the austere virtues of their founders.

"Such are the early traces of monastic principles and institutions, which, in a subsequent age, have counterbalanced all the temporal advantages of Christianity."*

In a most valuable "Memoir on the Advancement of Agriculture, addressed in 1795 to the Supreme Council of Castile, by the Patriotic Society of Madrid," the evils arising from monasteries are distinctly pointed out. After tracing the origin of monasteries, the Memoir proceeds: "At the same time that the prevalent laxity of morals among the clergy multiplied the number of convents, the vices of the proprietary monks gave rise to the mendicant orders, who, increasing, becoming proprietary, and equally immoral in their turn, occasioned the necessity of continual reformations. The consequence of such a multitude of religious orders, and the enormous multiplication of monasteries, of proprietary monks, and of others subsisting upon alms, has been the robbing of the industrious classes in society of subsistence and support. God forbid that the Society should take up its pen to vilify institutions whose sanctity it venerates, and which have rendered very essential service to the Church in most disastrous times. But having been called to point out in detail the evils which injure the cause of agriculture, could it conceal these facts, acknowledged by numbers of the most pious persons?"†

"The early institution of monasteries in the Spanish colonies, and the inconsiderate zeal in multiplying them, have been attended with consequences more fatal. In every new settlement the first object is to encourage population, and to incite every citizen to contribute towards augmenting the

* Gibbon's History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, vol. ii. p. 153; vol. iv. pp. 389, 394.

† Laborde's View of Spain, vol. iv. p. 192.

strength and number of the community. During the youth and vigour of society, while there is room to spread, and sustenance is procured with facility, mankind increase with amazing rapidity. But the Spaniards had hardly taken possession of America, when, with a most preposterous policy, they began to erect convents, where persons of both sexes were shut up under a vow to defeat the purpose of nature, and to counteract the first of her laws. Influenced by a misguided piety, which ascribes transcendant merit to a state of celibacy, or allured by the prospect of that listless ease which in sultry climates is deemed supreme felicity, numbers crowd into those mansions of sloth and superstition, and are lost to society. The impropriety of such foundations in any situation, where the extent of territory requires additional hands to improve it, is so obvious, that some Catholic states have expressly prohibited any persons in their colonies from taking the monastic vows. Even the Spanish monarchs, on some occasions, seem to have been alarmed with the spirit so adverse to the increase and prosperity of their colonies, that they have endeavoured to check it. But the Spaniards in America, more thoroughly under the influence of superstition than their countrymen in Europe, and directed by ecclesiastics more bigoted and illiterate, have conceived such a high opinion of monastic sanctity, that no regulations can restrain their zeal; and by the excess of their ill-judged bounty, religious houses have multiplied to a degree no less amazing than pernicious to society." *

In the year 1644 the city of Mexico presented a petition to the king, praying that no new monastery might be founded, and that the revenues of those already established might be circumscribed, otherwise the religious houses would soon acquire the property of the whole country; they request likewise that the bishops might be laid under restrictions in conferring holy orders, as there were at that time in New Spain above six thousand clergymen without any living. They must have been enormous abuses, indeed, when the

* Robertson's History of America, vol. iii. p. 233.

superstition of American Spaniards was shocked, and induced to remonstrate against them.*

When Canada was ceded to Great Britain, it was stipulated that the Catholic religion should remain established by law, but that there should be no more monks. All the monks then existing have since died, and their property has fallen to the government. It has, however, been judged advisable to concede so much to the prejudices of the people, as not to suppress the nunneries.†

When Peter the Great was carrying on the work of civilizing the Russians, he prohibited any of his subjects entering the monastery under fifty years of age.‡ If monasteries had been seats of civilization and of learning, he would rather have increased their number. Joseph, Emperor of Germany, suppressed the monasteries in his dominions, and applied their possessions to the service of the State. The abolition of the monasteries was one of the first measures of the French revolutionists, and it is to this circumstance that France is mainly indebted for her present prosperous condition, notwithstanding the horrid massacres and the tremendous wars she has since experienced. Even in Spain, measures were taken by the government to diminish the monks: and in consequence of these measures, the number of monks and nuns was, in the course of twenty years, between 1768 and 1788, reduced from 84,122 to 71,607 persons.§

No country has been more anxious than our own to curtail the power of the monks: for several ages previous to the Reformation, this object was stedfastly pursued by the legislature. Our Edward I., who is called the English Justinian, rigorously enforced the statute of mortmain, a statute which prevented any one bequeathing land to monasteries. The monks evaded this law, by getting the devotees to leave their estates to other persons for the use of the monastery. Hence arose the practice of uses and trusts. Subsequently the legis-

* Robertson's History of America, vol. iii. p. 332.

† Lambert's Travels through Lower Canada, vol. i. p. 342.

‡ Histoire de Russie sous Pierre le Grand, par M. de Voltaire, p. 98.

§ Laborde's View of Spain, vol. iv. p. 28.

lature prohibited this also. The statute of mortmain is still in force. No person can now leave land to a religious or a charitable society.*

THE USURPATIONS OF THE CLERGY.

In the former Essays I have shown that Popery degraded the nation, inasmuch as while the supremacy of the Pope was acknowledged, a Roman priest could depose our monarchs, could excommunicate any individual in the country, and even place the whole kingdom under an interdict; could instigate the nation to wars for the honour of the holy see; could present Italian clergymen to English church-livings, and could decide all appeals carried to Rome from our ecclesiastical courts. I showed that it was popery which impoverished the country, inasmuch as the immense influence which the Pope possessed in England was employed for the purpose of draining this country of money, as the Italian priests who held English benefices never came to England, but spent their revenues in Italy; as the appeals to the Roman pontiff caused immense sums of money to be spent in Rome; as the Pope received the first-fruits and tenths of English benefices; as a great number of relics and consecrated articles were imported from Rome, and paid for in English gold; as immense sums of money were expended in making pilgrimages to Rome; as the Pope derived a great revenue from this country, by means of dispensations and absolutions; as the Pope received what was called Peter's pence, being a tax of a penny on every house in the kingdom: as the monks or religious orders could be taxed by the chief of the order, who drew the money from England, and spent it in Italy or in some other foreign country; as the foreign monasteries, styled alien priories, were often endowed with the revenues arising from English lands; as legates or other ecclesiastics were often sent hither to make contributions for foreign

* Blackstone's Commentaries, vol. ii. p. 268.

objects; and, finally, as the Popes claimed the right of levying what taxes they chose upon the English clergy. From the supremacy of the Pope I proceeded, in the last article, to prove that Popery impoverished the country, by means of monastic institutions. I showed that these institutions deprived the country of a great many useful hands; that they were a most grievous burden to the industrious classes of the community; that they were the principal means of maintaining the authority of the Pope in this country; that they cherished a spirit of superstition, by means of relics, pretended miracles, and other gross impositions; that they were the seats of gross fraud and immoralities, and that they spread idleness and beggary among the "main body of the people." I shall now trace the effects of the Reformation, in the removal of a variety of other evils connected with Popery. These evils I have classed under the head of the Usurpations of the Clergy. These usurpations tended greatly to enslave and impoverish the people, and for their removal we are indebted to the Reformation.

1. The Reformation has diminished the wealth of the clergy.

It is the doctrine of Adam Smith, that the richer the Church, the poorer the State. "It may be laid down as a certain maxim, that, all other things being supposed equal, the richer the Church, the poorer must necessarily be either the sovereign on the one hand or the people on the other, and in all cases the less able must the State be to defend itself. In several Protestant countries, particularly in all the Protestant cantons of Switzerland, the revenue which anciently belonged to the Roman Catholic church, the tithes and church-lands, has been found a fund sufficient not only to afford competent salaries to the established clergy, but to defray, with little or no addition, all the other expenses of the State.* In England the clergy were at least as wealthy as in other states. "In the sixth of Henry IV. the Commons proposed in plain terms to the king, that he should seize all

* Smith's Wealth of Nations, vol. iv. p. 65.

the temporalities of the Church, and employ them as a perpetual fund to serve the exigencies of the State. They insisted that the clergy possessed a third of the lands in the kingdom, that they contributed nothing to the public burdens, and that their riches tended only to disqualify them from performing their ministerial functions with proper zeal and attention. In the eleventh year of the king they returned to the charge with more zeal than before; they made a calculation of all the ecclesiastical revenues, which, by their account, amounted to 485,000 marks a year, and contained 18,400 ploughs of land. They proposed to divide this property among fifteen new earls, 1,500 knights, 6,000 esquires, and 100 hospitals, besides 20,000 pounds a year, which the king might take for his own use."*

By the Reformation the sum of this enormous wealth has been in some degree diminished. In the first place all the wealth of the monasteries has been taken from the Church. This property alone would, according to Sir John Sinclair,† bring in at the present time a revenue of six millions sterling per annum. The lands of these monasteries, too, were tithe-free, and hence their present possessors do not pay tithe to the Church.

The bishoprics have also been much reduced in value. In the reign of Henry VIII.‡ seventy manors were taken from the archbishopric of York, and other bishoprics suffered in proportion. It was a common practice with Queen Elizabeth, when a bishopric became vacant, to make the new bishop relinquish some of the lands belonging to the see. In the civil wars which occurred in the time of Charles I., the Church suffered severely, as the clergy, for the most part, took the side of their monarch. Yet, after all these deductions, will any one complain of the poverty of the Church of England? But if the clergy are now so rich, how rich must they have been in the days of Henry VIII.?

* Hume's History of England, vol. i. p. 366.

† Sinclair's History of the Revenue, vol. i. p. 184.

‡ Ibid.

Besides these abstractions from the property of the clergy, many sources of revenue are lopped off, such as confession and penance, contribution at feast-days, expenses of images, masses, and pilgrimages—all these things brought money to the clergy. It was calculated in the reign of Henry II. that by penance alone the clergy obtained more money than all the funds and taxes that were paid into the king's exchequer.* The Reformation has taken a large portion of property from the Church, and given it to the people; it has also prevented the people giving a great deal of money to the Church, which they would otherwise give. How, then, are we impoverished by the Reformation?

But the Church would, no doubt, in a course of years, accumulate a fresh stock of property, were it not for the abolition of the celibacy of the clergy. Many of our clergy have still enormous revenues, and get immensely rich; but they do not give their property to their own order. No; they have families, and consequently they leave their money to their children. The property accumulated in the service of the Church is thus restored to society: it again circulates through the channels of agriculture and commerce, and tends to enrich the community.

The enormous wealth of the clergy was, no doubt, one main cause of the bad state of their morals.

"The bishops were grossly ignorant; they seldom resided in their dioceses, except it had been to riot it at high festivals; and all the effect their residence could have was, to corrupt others by their ill example: they followed the court of princes and aspired to the greatest offices. The abbots and monks were wholly given up to luxury and idleness, and the unmarried state both of the seculars and regulars gave infinite scandal to the world; for it appeared, the restraining them from having wives of their own made them conclude they had a right to all other men's. The inferior clergy were no better; and not having places of retreat to conceal their vices in, as the monks had, they

* Hume's Eng. vol. i. p. 137.

became more public. In short, all ranks of churchmen were so universally despised and hated, that the world was very apt to be possessed with prejudices against their doctrines; for the worship of God was so defiled with gross superstition, that, without great inquiries, all men were easily convinced that the Church stood in great need of a reformation."*

2. The Reformation has diminished the number of the clergy.

For the same reasons which induce all despotic monarchs to increase their standing armies, the Popes were always anxious to increase the number of the clergy. These formed the Pope's army, spread in different cantons over all Europe: these were the instruments with which he was enabled to tyrannize over the rest of mankind. He separated them from all other men by the vow of celibacy; he exempted them from the jurisdiction of civil laws; and their property was under his special protection. Every one knows, that if a small State support a large standing army, that State will be impoverished. That State, too, which supports a large army of priests, will also be impoverished. The clergy, like the soldiers, are what Adam Smith calls unproductive labourers: they toil not, neither do they spin. Although they may be classed with the most respectable and honourable characters, they contribute nothing to the stock of national wealth. They are supported by the industry of others. An army of priests is, in fact, a greater evil than an army of soldiers. The latter, however destructive to civil liberty, may be useful in repelling an external foe; the former are not only incapable of defending us, but by some of the degrading doctrines they preach, would often render us incapable of defending ourselves.

It is but in few countries that we are able to ascertain the exact number of the clergy; but we are able to do this precisely, in regard to Spain and France before the Revolution. Laborde, a learned and intelligent Frenchman, makes the following statements:—

* Burnet's History of the Reformation, abridged, p. 29.

STATE OF THE CLERGY OF FRANCE BEFORE THE REVOLUTION.

Secular clergy	241,989
Monks	78,015
Nuns	79,972
Inferior ministers of the churches	60,302
	460,278

NUMBER OF THE SPANISH CLERGY IN 1788.

Monks of 1,925 convents	49,238
Nuns of 1,081 convents	22,347
Secular clergy	60,238
Ministers of churches	15,834
	147,657

"The clergy of France, as appears from the above summary, amounted to one fifty-second of the whole population, estimating this latter at about twenty-five millions; whereas the clergy of Spain, if the population of this country be reckoned at eleven millions, forms no more than one sixty-ninth of the whole."* No *more* than one sixty-ninth of the whole! that is, about one thirty-fourth of the grown-up people; and a still greater proportion of the men are employed in the services of churches and convents. Now, let me suppose that the same proportion of the population of England, at the present moment, were devoted to the Church, how many ecclesiastics should we have? Let us take twelve millions of the population of this island, and then it will appear that, if we had the same proportion of clergy which they had in Spain, we should have upwards of one hundred and seventy-two thousands; and if we had them in the same proportion which they had in France, we should have upwards of two hundred and thirty thousands; and it is probable that before the Reformation, the clergy in those countries, as well as in our own, were still more numerous. These accounts, too, include those only who are strictly

* Laborde's View of Spain, vol. v. p. 15.

ecclesiastics; but there must have been a variety of subordinate officers, all of whom must have been supported at the public expense. So, altogether, this country must have had a goodly number of persons who were abstracted from the active pursuits of life, who added nothing to the public wealth by their own labour; but who, on the contrary, devoured the produce of the industry of others. The Reformation set all these people at work, and thus enabled them to support themselves, and enrich their country, and no longer to be burdensome to the other classes of the community. How then are we impoverished by the Reformation?

3. The Reformation has abolished the celibacy of the clergy.

The design of this forced celibacy was, no doubt, to separate the clergy from the rest of mankind, and hence render them devoted to the holy see. It was admirably adapted to promote this end; for when a man has only one passion which he is allowed to indulge, that passion becomes so much the stronger. As the monks were excluded from society, the effects of this unnatural prohibition is in them more observable. Such was their devotion to the Pope that they practised the grossest and the basest tricks in order to get money from the people for the good of the Church. Such was their cruelty that they were the chief instruments in carrying on the tortures of the Spanish Inquisition. This is the effect which this unnatural state tends to produce on the mind when the vow of celibacy is faithfully kept. But in very many instances this was not the case. We must deny the truth of all history, if we do not admit that, previous to the Reformation, the clergy were remarkable for their profligacy and debauchery. So notorious was this that, with a view of diminishing the evil, the Pope was in the habit of granting licences to the priests to keep concubines. "After the canons which established the celibacy of the clergy were, by the vigorous endeavours of Archbishop Anselm, more rigorously executed in England, the clergy gave almost universally and avowedly into the use of concubinage; and the court of Rome, which had no interest in prohibiting this practice,

made very slight opposition to it. The custom was become so prevalent, that in some canton in Switzerland, before the Reformation, the laws not only permitted, but, to avoid scandal, enjoined the use of concubines to the younger clergy; and it was usual everywhere for priests to apply to the ordinary, and obtain from him a formal liberty for this indulgence."* "The restraining of the clergy," says Bishop Burnet, in the quotation already made, "from having wives of their own, made them conclude that they had a right to those of all other men."

4. The Reformation has rendered the property of the clergy liable to be taxed by the civil power.

Previous to the Reformation, all the property belonging to the Church was under the special protection of the Pope. Some of the Popes claimed the right of taxing the clergy at pleasure, though this right was sometimes disputed. There was no dispute, however, respecting the right of the king and the parliament. Neither of these could lay their impious hands on the goods of St. Peter. Pope Boniface VIII.† issued a bull prohibiting all the princes of Christendom from touching the property of the clergy, and even prohibiting the clergy from giving anything of their own accord. None of the clergy dared disobey this bull. The measures pursued by Edward I. compelled them to have recourse to an expedient somewhat similar to that which is sometimes practised, in regard to tithes, by members of the Society of Friends. They put the money in a church, and the king's officers came and took it away. The clergy formed a separate body in the State, and consequently taxed themselves. How far their payments were equal to what they ought to have paid, in proportion to their property, it is not now easy to ascertain; but it is certain they did not give satisfaction to the House of Commons, for that house complained, in the reign of Henry IV., that the clergy contributed nothing to the public burdens.‡ The Archbishop of Canterbury declared that, although the clergy did not go to war, yet that day and night they offered up their prayers for the happiness and

* Hume's England, vol. i. p. 187. † Ib. p. 263. ‡ Ib. p. 306.

prosperity of the State. The speaker smiled and answered without reserve, that he thought the prayers of the Church a very slender supply.

It was ascertained at the French Revolution, that the French clergy, who paid only 11,000,000 of livres, should, according to their fair proportion of property, have paid 17,000,000.

The clergy of England before the Reformation knew how to take care of their money, as well as those of other countries, and of later times. But had the clergy paid their proportionate share of the public burdens, their separation from the other classes was exceedingly objectionable. They had always the means of disturbing the civil government. When the kings wanted money, they were induced to make imprudent grants to the clergy. The persecutions against the Protestants were often enforced by needy monarchs, that they might more effectually secure the favour of the Church.

Though the abolition of this privilege of the clergy, in regard to pecuniary matters, is an effect of the Reformation, it did not take place immediately on that event. The clergy continued to vote supplies to the Crown till the reign of Charles II., when the power of taxing the clergy was surrendered to the parliament. The convocation, however, continued to meet till the reign of George I., when their assembly was found to be so hostile to the interest of the government, that their sittings were prorogued for ever.

5. The Reformation has rendered the clergy subject to the jurisdiction of the civil courts.

Previous to the Reformation, no clergyman, whatever crimes he might commit, could be punished by the civil power. He must be delivered up to the ecclesiastical power, who would try him and punish him for his crime. As the judges were all clergymen, and wished to uphold the dignity of their order, the evidence adduced would, naturally enough, be made to bear as lightly as possible against the accused. But what was worse than this, the punishments inflicted were all ecclesiastical punishments. A clergyman might be

deprived—he might be excommunicated; but as to putting him to death, that would have been such an outrage on the sacerdotal character that the circumstance would have convulsed the kingdom. The unhappy disputes between Henry II. and Thomas à Becket originated in a wish of the king to render the clerical culprits amenable to the civil power, after they had been deprived by their own order. "The ecclesiastics in that age had renounced all immediate subordination to the magistrate; they openly pretended to an exemption, in criminal accusations, from a trial before courts of justice, and were gradually introducing a like exemption in civil causes; spiritual penalties alone could be inflicted on their offences; and as the clergy had extremely multiplied in England, and many of them were, consequently, of very low characters, crimes of the deepest dye, murders, robberies, adulteries, rapes, were daily committed with impunity by the ecclesiastics. It had been found, for instance, on inquiry, that no less than a hundred murders had, since the king's accession, been perpetrated by men of that profession who had never been called to account for these offences, and holy orders were become a full protection for all enormities. A clerk in Worcestershire having debauched a gentleman's daughter, had at this time proceeded to murder the father; and the general indignation against this crime moved the king to attempt the remedy of an abuse which was become so palpable, and to require that the clerk should be delivered up, and receive condign punishment from the magistrate. Becket insisted on the privileges of the Church, confined the criminal in the bishop's prison, lest he should be seized by the king's officers, maintained that no greater punishment could be inflicted on him than degradation; and when the king demanded that immediately after he was degraded he should be tried by the civil power, the primate asserted, that it was iniquitous to try a man twice upon the same accusation, and for the same offence."*

During several centuries the civil and the ecclesiastical powers were occasionally at variance respecting this privilege

* Hume's England, vol. i. p. 137.

of the clergy. And although a few of our most powerful monarchs were sometimes too strong for the clergy, yet they were sure to recover their ground as soon as a prince of inferior talents ascended the throne. The following circumstance occurred in the reign of Henry VIII., and but a few years before the Reformation was introduced into England:—"The immunity of churchmen for crimes committed by them till they were first degraded by the spirituality, occasioned the only contest that was in the beginning of this reign between the secular and ecclesiastical courts. King Henry VII. passed a law that clerks convict should be burnt in the hand. A temporary law was also made in the beginning of this reign, that murderers and robbers, not being bishops, priests, nor deacons, should be denied the benefit of clergy; but this was to last only till the next parliament, and so being not continued by it, the act determined. The Abbot of Winchelcomb preached severely against it, as being contrary to the laws of God and the liberties of the holy Church, and said that all that assented to it had fallen under the censures of the Church. And afterwards he published a book to prove that all clerks, even of the lowest orders, were sacred, and could not be judged by the temporal courts. This being done in parliament time, the temporal Lords, with the Commons, addressed the king, desiring him to repress the insolence of the clergy. So a public hearing was appointed before the king and all the judges. Dr. Standish, a Franciscan, argued against the immunity, and proved that the judging clerks had in all times practised in England, and that it was necessary for the peace and safety of mankind that all crimes should be punished. The Abbot argued on the other side, and said it was contrary to a decree of the Church, and was a sin in itself. Standish answered, that all decrees were not observed; for, notwithstanding the decrees for residence, bishops did not reside at their cathedrals. And since no decree did bind till it was received, this concerning immunity, which was never received in England, did not bind. After they had fully argued the matter, the laity were all of opinion that the friar was too

hard for the abbot, and so moved the king that the bishops might be ordered to make him preach a recantation sermon. But they refused to do it, and said they were bound by their oaths to maintain his opinion. Standish was upon this much hated by the clergy, but the matter was let fall; yet the clergy carried the point, for the law was not continued."*

6. The Reformation has excluded the clergy from holding offices in the State.

"There were strong reasons," says Mr. Hume,† "which might discourage the kings of England in those ages from bestowing the chief offices of the Crown on prelates and other ecclesiastical persons. These men had so entrenched themselves in privileges and immunities, and so openly challenged an exemption from all secular jurisdiction, that no civil penalty could be inflicted on them for any malversation in office; and as even treason itself was declared to be no canonical offence, nor was allowed to be a sufficient reason for deprivation or other spiritual censures, that order of men had assured to themselves an almost total impunity, and were not bound by any political law or statute. But, on the other hand, there were many causes which favoured their promotion. Besides that they possessed almost all the learning of the day, and were best qualified for civil employments, the prelates enjoyed equal dignity with the greatest barons, and gave weight by their personal authority to the powers intrusted with them, while at the same time they did not endanger the Crown by accumulating wealth or influence in their families, and were restrained, by the decency of their character, from that open rapine and violence so often practised by the nobles." But from whatever cause it may have arisen, certain it is, that most of the places of honour and profit in the State were filled by ecclesiastics. All the offices in the ecclesiastical courts, though now occupied by laymen, were, before the Reformation, occupied by reverend divines. They abounded, too, in the Court of Chancery. There is, perhaps, no office in this country of so much

* Burnet's History of the Reformation, abridged by himself, p. 14.

† Hume's England, vol. i. p. 306.

importance as that of the Lord Chancellor. "He is superior in point of presidency to every temporal lord. He is privy councillor by his office, and prolocutor of the House of Lords, and to him belongs the appointment of all justices of the peace throughout the kingdom."*

This post was for a succession of ages filled by the ecclesiastics, who seem to have very much extended its privileges; for, besides the privileges above mentioned, the Lord Chancellor "became the keeper of the king's conscience, visitor in right of the king of all hospitals and colleges of the king's foundation, and patron of all the king's livings under the value of 20*l.* per annum in the king's books. He is the general guardian of all infants, idiots, and lunatics, and has the general superintendence of all charitable uses in the kingdom. And all this over and above the vast and extensive jurisdiction which he exercises in his judicial capacity in the Court of Chancery."

These privileges were at first granted to the Lord Chancellor, who was an ecclesiastic, to enable him to provide comfortably for those clergymen who were employed in the subordinate offices. Besides all this, it was often the case that a churchman was the king's prime minister; and hence arose another source of honour and profit to the Church. Now, just calculate the immense influence the clergy must have had in this country, when, in addition to all their lands, their tithes, their charges for spiritual services, and the free-will offerings, they had the possession of all these important posts, when they could decide at their pleasure all the causes brought into the courts of chancery, or into the ecclesiastical courts, while at the same time they were themselves exempt from all civil jurisdiction.

In the reign of Edward III. the parliament petitioned the king, that he would employ no churchman in any office of state;† and in the reign of Charles I. an act was passed excluding clergymen from civil offices, but it was repealed in the reign of Charles II. There is now, I believe, no law preventing an ecclesiastic from being a lord of the treasury,

* Blackstone, vol. iii. p. 47. † Hume's Eng. vol. i. p. 335.

or a secretary of state; but the practice is justly laid aside, and for this we are indebted to the Reformation.

7. The Reformation has diminished the jurisdiction of the bishops, and other ecclesiastical courts.

In the time of our Saxon ancestors, the ecclesiastical and the civil formed only one court. William the Conqueror having obtained his crown from the Pope and the clergy, gratified them so far as to separate these two courts. The trials in the ecclesiastical court were not according to the English common law, but according to the Roman civil law. Here was no trial by jury taken from the people—no examining the witnesses face to face: all the proceedings were in Latin, and all the judges were ecclesiastics. From this court an appeal lay not to the House of Lords, but to the Pope at Rome. In this court were tried all causes relating to wills, vows, marriages, and all ecclesiastical matters. It must have been very gratifying to a clergyman, who had a suit in this court, to know that all the judges would be clergymen; and how charming it must have been to a man, suing for a divorce, to know that all his judges would be bachelors. In addition to the civil law, the clergy brought in the canon law, that is to say, the canons or decrees of the Pope. The court having jurisdiction over all heresies, tried and punished all spiritual offenders as they pleased. The abuses and oppressions of this court were the subject of a long complaint preferred to Henry VIII. by the House of Commons.* A clergyman guilty of any offence could be tried only in the ecclesiastical court. This privilege first granted to men of the sacerdotal order, was afterwards extended, through their influence, to several classes of laymen, and was called "the benefit of clergy." After the culprit was convicted in a civil court, he might demand a new trial in an ecclesiastical court, and the trial was conducted in the following way:—"The ordinary, not satisfied with the proofs adduced in the profane secular court, set himself formally to work to make a purgation of the offender by a new canonical trial, although he had been previously

* Hume's England, vol. i. p. 532.

convicted by his country, or perhaps by his own confession. This trial was held before the bishop in person, or his deputy, and by a jury of twelve clerks! and there first the party himself was required to make oath of his own innocence; next there was to be the oath of twelve compurgators, who swore they believed he spoke the truth; then witnesses were to be examined upon oath, but on behalf of the prisoner only; and, lastly, the jury were to bring in their verdict upon oath, which usually acquitted the prisoner; otherwise, if a clerk, he was degraded, or put to penance."* But all these things are now happily abolished: this court has now no right to summon us to answer for our opinions, to condemn us for pretended heresies, to appoint penances which may be commuted for a large sum of money, or to excommunicate us from human society, or to sanction the crimes of ecclesiastics.

8. The Reformation has abolished the right of sanctuary.

Among most pagan nations the temples of religion were asylums for criminals. The Papists, among other heathen customs, adopted this. If any criminal, however atrocious, ran to consecrated ground, his life was safe. Previous to the Reformation, the abuses connected with these places in England were very enormous, as appears from the following description of them by Stow:—"Unthrifts riot and run in debt upon the boldness of these places; yea, and rich men run thither with poor men's goods; there they build; there they spend, and bid their creditors go whistle them. Men's wives run thither with their husbands' plate, and say they dare not abide with their husbands for beating. Thieves bring thither their stolen goods, and live thereon. There devise they new robberies nightly; they steal out and rob, and reave and kill, and come in again, as though these places gave them not only a safeguard for the harm they have done, but a licence to do more."

Notwithstanding the evils necessarily connected with these asylums, the clergy have always been so anxious to maintain

* Blackstone's Commentaries, vol. iv. p. 368.

this privilege, that the violation of a sanctuary by the viceroy of Mexico led to his deposition. "A man convicted of a multitude of crimes, sought impunity for all his enormities at the foot of the altars. The Viceroy Gelves caused him to be dragged from thence. This act of necessary justice was construed into an outrage against the Divinity. The thunder of excommunication was immediately sent forth, and the people rose. The regular and secular clergy took up arms; the palace of the commander was burnt; his guards, friends, and partisans were put to the sword; he himself was put in irons, and sent to Europe, with seventy gentlemen who had not been afraid to espouse his cause. The archbishop, who was the author of all these calamities, and whose vengeance was not yet satisfied, pursued his victim with the wish and desire of sacrificing him. The court, after having hesitated for some time, decided at length in favour of fanaticism. The defender of the rights of the throne and of order was condemned to total oblivion, and his successor was authorized solemnly to consecrate all the notions of superstition, and particularly the superstition of asylums."*

It is very probable that the practice of assassination, so frequent in Italy, was at first occasioned by the number of asylums. If a ruffian were to assassinate my nearest relative, and run to one of these asylums, he is safe; should he afterwards obtain absolution, he may then walk the streets in perfect security. What, then, must I patiently bear this? No; I will kill him in return, and run to an asylum myself. In this way assassination probably commenced, till it became so general, that it was no longer disgraceful. Nothing can be more destructive to the wealth, the industry, or the happiness of a nation, than a bad police. But what order can be established, or what security is there for life or for property in a country where there are such institutions as asylums—institutions which make the Deity the protector in this world of the crimes which he will punish in the next? In England, this privilege of sanctuary was greatly restrained by Henry VIII., and totally abolished under James I.

* Raynal's History of the Indies, vol. ii. p. 360.

9. The Reformation has diminished the number of holy days.

We have already said, that the sum of national labour is the sum of national wealth. Whatever, therefore, diminishes the sum of national labour, diminishes the sum of national wealth. The Catholic church has an immense number of saints' days and holidays, all of which, before the Reformation, were observed more strictly than the Sunday. Not only was the nation injured by the loss of so many working days, but the occupations of these holy days, by destroying the habit of industry, rendered the labour of the working days less productive.

"The Sabbath, considering it only under a political point of view, is an admirable institution. It was proper to give a stated day of rest to mankind, that they might have time to recover themselves, to lift up their eyes to heaven, to enjoy life with reflection, to meditate upon past events, to reason upon present transactions, and, in some measure, to form plans for the future. But by multiplying those days of inactivity, hath not that which was established for the advantage of individuals and societies been converted into a calamity for them? Would not a soil which should be ploughed three hundred days in the year, by strong and vigorous animals, yield double the produce of that which should only be worked one hundred and fifty days in the year? What strange infatuation! Torrents of blood have been shed an infinite number of times to prevent the dismembering of a territory, or to increase its extent; and yet the powers intrusted with the maintenance and happiness of empires have patiently suffered that a priest, sometimes even a foreign priest, should invade successively one-third of this territory by the proportional diminution of labour which alone could fertilize it! This inconceivable disorder has ceased in several states, but it continues in the south of Europe. This is one of the greatest obstacles to the increase of its subsistence and of its population."*

* Raynal's History of the Indies, vol. iv. p. 275.

Mons. Dupáty, speaking of the abolition of some religious holidays by the Grand Duke of Tuscany, says: "The prayers offered up to God for harvests no longer bring down famine on the country. This prince has enriched the year with a great number of working days, which he has recovered from superstition to restore them to agriculture, to the arts, and good morals."*

The manner in which these religious festivals were observed tended to injure the morals of the people. Although a pompous procession formed one part of the show, yet religion had but little to do in the matter. The Baron Stolberg relates the observance of a festival sacred to St. Cataldo, which resembled a pastime in our Smithfield fair, held, be it remembered, in honour of Saint Bartholomew. The following was one of the pious ceremonies observed on this occasion:—"A high pole, which was soaped two-thirds of its height, was erected before the gate, in honour of St. Cataldo. A wheel was fastened above, which was hung with hams, fowls, flasks, cheeses, sausages, and viands. To climb up the pole was the task; and, after many vain attempts and tumbles, at length one adventurer took possession of the wheel. Loud shouts of joy then resounded from the place, the city walls, and the round towers, all of which were covered with the thronging multitude."†

These festivals were always employed by the priests as the means of getting money. Nothing would seem more proper than that the people should place their pecuniary offerings on the altar of the saint to whose honour the festival was held. This money was of course placed in the hands of the priesthood.

The fast-days, though not attended by an abstinence from labour, were very injurious to the nation. During the whole of Lent, and on many other days in the year, the people were not allowed to eat meat or eggs. Their chief food was fish and vegetables. As there was no demand for meat on these

* Travels through Italy, p. 71.

† Stolberg's Travels, vol. iii. p. 257.

days, fewer cattle were reared, and the value of land was consequently diminished. Hard-working men must have felt this prohibition very severely, and many of the sick must have died. Could not a dispensation be procured from the Pope? Yes, by paying for it; but the price was so exorbitant, that the generality of people were unable to buy.

In order to form a correct estimate of the benefits we have derived from the Reformation, it is useful to view the effects which Popish principles have in our own times produced on Catholic nations. This is a test to which no Catholic can object: for no one will contend that the Popery of the present day is more pernicious to national prosperity than was the Popery of former ages. Let us see what sentiments are entertained by enlightened men respecting the effects produced by holidays in Spain. "The multiplicity of feasts lessens the number of working days. It is true that the former have been virtually much abridged; but then persons are obliged on such days to attend mass, and this occasions much loss of time, especially to such labourers as are occupied at a distance from a church. Many also entertain scruples of conscience respecting the working on such holidays, though they have been suppressed. The diocese of Toledo still retains forty-one feast-days, which, added to fifty-two Sundays, make the sum of ninety-three days, leaving only two hundred and seventy-two for the purposes of labour, even supposing the peasants would labour on those holidays which have been suppressed. The titular saints of particular parishes, the patron saints of private families, the guardian saints of individuals, are so many other feasts by which labour is temporarily suspended. It may be said of these feasts to saints as of the frequenting a multitude of hermitages and isolated chapels, that they celebrate some for the sake of vows, some for devotion, some through custom, and others, by far the greatest number, for the pleasure of rambling. The Count de Capomanez states the sum lost every feast-day by the suspension of labour at six millions of reals, or four millions of livres tournois. He here comprehends those

employed in trade and manufacture, as well as those occupied in agriculture."*

If, as Dr. Adam Smith has proved, labour, in a national point of view, constitutes wealth, what a prodigious loss does Spain annually experience by the effects of a blind superstition! Taking the livre at tenpence English, then 4,000,000 livres are equal to 166,666*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*, the loss of one day. Allowing the number of feast-days thus retained to be forty-one in the year, the annual deficiency will amount to 6,833,333*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.*!!!

Now, let us think on these immense privileges which the clergy enjoyed before the Reformation, and ask ourselves how we should like the present clergy of the English Church to be invested with similar privileges? How should we like the numbers, the annual revenues, and the landed property of the clergy to be increased to the same proportion in which they were before the Reformation? How should we like their property to be exempt from taxation by the parliament? How should we like their civil immunities to be restored? How should we like our ecclesiastical courts, the court of chancery, and the civil offices of state to be all crowded with parsons? How should we like our criminals to be sheltered from the hand of justice by flying to a churchyard? How should we like to see our agriculturists and manufacturers taken from their work two or three days in a week, that they might recite paternosters at church, or form a procession in honour of a saint? What, in our unbiassed moments, should we say to a man who gravely told us that the adoption of measures such as these would exalt and enrich the country?

COSTLY CEREMONIALS.

If the end of religion were to get money out of people's pockets, the Popish religion would be the best in the world. All its doctrines and its precepts centre on this one object.

* Laborde's View of Spain, vol. iv. pp. 42, 43.

It may be supposed that I have already pointed out all the means by which this object was effected. But the ceremonial of Popery yet remains to be examined. And now I shall show what enormous sums of money were extracted from the pockets of the people, merely by those burthensome ceremonies which they were compelled to observe. In doing this, I shall make some pretty long extracts from a work of De Souligny, a Frenchman, who fled hither from France on the revocation of the edict of Nantes. His book was published in 1698, and is entitled, "The Political Mischiefs of Popery." The external observances of the Popish religion are much the same all over the world, and certainly were not more oppressive in France, in the reign of Louis XIV., than they were in this country before the Reformation.

I. By the Reformation we have saved all the money which would otherwise be expended in masses.

"The chief are their masses which they say for the living and the dead, viz. to deliver the souls of the deceased, not from hell, but from purgatory, and to expiate the sins of the living, who either pay for those masses or assist at saying them. This is the clergy's greatest traffic, and that which contributes most of anything to retain all Popish states and kingdoms under the Pope's tyrannical yoke, by the multitudes of priests and monks that it entertains, who are as so many armies to support that usurper, and who render him master of all those kingdoms. There are churches where above fifty or a hundred such masses are said every day upon a great number of altars, as they call them, which raise subsistence for a great number of priests and monks, and did formerly maintain a greater number.

"The parliament of Paris hath regulated their pay at 12*d.* per mass, and in divers provinces they have not above 5*d.* or 6*d.* a piece, which is as good at least as the pay of horse and foot.

"Abundance of masses are said for the cure of diseases, both in men and women, children, beasts, and birds, as hogs, dogs, geese, &c. As also for a happy journey, safe return of a ship, a happy marriage: as also for mere trifles; as for the finding again of a lost ring, fork, spoon, &c.; nay, even for

success in an assassination, or plot against a prince, or a robbery, &c.; that is to say, they do really sacrifice (as they themselves pretend) the body of Jesus Christ in all those cases, and many others of the same nature.

"I am also well assured, that in order to bring money into the priests' pockets, they have in some places introduced a custom of playing at dice and cards, for masses, as well as prayers; and he that loses, pays the priest, who does really next morning, as he pretends, sacrifice Jesus Christ for the expiation of the winner's sins and crimes, how heinous soever they may be. I own that I never saw them play for masses, but have divers times seen them play for prayers, and know no reason why they may not as well play for the other. In the time of Pope Leo X. the preachers of indulgencies played for the pardon of the sins of towns and cities in Germany.

"Sometimes it happens that a dying person orders 100, 1,000, 6,000, nay 10,000, masses to be said for the repose of his soul after his death, for which his heirs pay through the nose. There are very few Roman Catholics who are not guilty of this weakness at their death; but if some of those who understand better, despise those fooleries upon their death-bed, their friends, who are not so well informed, are sure to order masses for them, and pay the priests for their pains; nay, the very poorest of them always take care to have some masses said.

"Besides this, there is every year an anniversary, as they call it, for most people which have left any estate behind them, or whose friends are well to pass, that is to say, a mass sung for the soul of the deceased by a great number of priests, sometimes fifty or a hundred together, who must all of them be splendidly treated afterwards, where they usually fuddle themselves, and each of them must have a piece of money besides.

"It is, then, upon the account of the great profit which the mass brings to the clergy that they have made it one of the essential parts of their worship." *

* De Souligny.

II. By the Reformation we have saved all the money which would otherwise be expended in confessions.

"Auricular confession is also one of their most gainful inventions, by which they shear their flocks four times a year. There are few people who do not at such times give them a piece of money, especially those who are guilty of great crimes; and thereupon they receive absolution, provided that, together with this, they do some little troublesome thing which the priests impose upon them, under the notion of penance, the better to colour that infamous traffic, and to make the people believe that it is not for the money they absolve them, for that would appear odious even to the most dissolute wretch in the world. I take no notice here of the great advantage the Pope and his clergy make of this confession to dive into the secrets of princes and grandees, that so they may make their own use of it, and take their measures thereupon to pry into the greatest secrets of men and women, which gives the ecclesiastics an opportunity to debauch all the sex, or to squeeze money out of them; for by this means they lead captive silly women laden with sins, and carried away with divers lusts, according to the words of the text." *

III. By the Reformation we have saved all the money which we should otherwise have given for penance.

About the time of the crusades, "a year of penance was appreciated at twenty-six solidi of silver, about four pounds sterling, for the rich; at three solidi, or nine shillings, for the indigent; and these alms were soon appropriated to the use of the church, which derived from the redemption of sins an inexhaustible source of opulence and dominion. A debt of three hundred years, or twelve hundred pounds, was enough to impoverish a plentiful fortune. The scarcity of gold and silver was supplied by the alienation of land, and the princely donations of Pepin and Charlemagne are expressly given for the remedy of their soul." †

"Among their other inventions to obtain money, the clergy had inculcated the necessity of penance as an atonement for sin, and having again introduced the practice of paying them

* De Souligny. † Gibbon's Rome, vol. vii. p. 223.

large sums as a commutation, or species of atonement for the remission of those penances, the sins of the people, by these means, had become a revenue to the priests; and the king computed that, by this invention alone, they levied more money upon his subjects than flowed by all the funds and taxes into the royal exchequer. That he might ease the people of so heavy and arbitrary an imposition, Henry required that a civil officer of his appointment should be present in all ecclesiastical courts, and should for the future give his consent to every composition which was made with sinners for their spiritual offences." *

IV. By the Reformation we have saved all the money which would otherwise be expended in pilgrimages to holy wells and other sacred places.

In my Essay upon Papal Usurpations, I spoke of the pilgrimages to Rome; but Rome was not the only place to which pilgrimages were made. In our own country there were numerous consecrated spots, to which people repaired with a view of obtaining temporal or spiritual benefits. One of the most celebrated was the shrine of St. Thomas à Becket, at which place the priests received in one year 954*l.* 6*s.* 3*d.*†

There are similar places in Ireland at the present day. Loch Dearg, for instance, where the ferryman pays 260*l.* per annum ‡ for the privilege of carrying the pilgrims to the sacred island. Such is the concourse of people to this place that it maintains an establishment of four-and-twenty priests. Not only do the Catholic people lose their time and spend their money in making pilgrimages to such places, but they drive their cattle thither also, in order to obtain for them the blessing of the presiding saint. In the "Tablettes Romains,"§ recently published by the Count St. Domingo, the following description is given of a festival in Italy:—"Speaking of

* Hume's England, vol. i. p. 136.

† Burnet's Abridgment of the Reformation, p. 201.

‡ Dillon's Sketches of the Scenery, History, and Antiquity in the North-west of Ireland. Dublin, 1818.

§ I have not a copy of this book, as it has been suppressed by the French Government; I therefore quote from a review of it in the first volume of "The Iris," p. 167.

dirtiness, reminds me of the pig, and the pig reminds me of St. Anthony, who reminds me of this festival. As that saint was fond of this dirty animal, devotees have concluded that he was fond of every other animal, or bird, or beast, and he is invested with the protectoral-general of all that breathe. On the day of his festival, which is celebrated at Rome with great solemnity, the street in which this church is situated is crowded with horses, and asses, and pigs, on the heads of which the priests call down celestial benedictions, having first, however, secured a fee for every beast. The lower classes, who are too poor to possess such important animals, bring under their arms cocks, hens, and turkeys (ornamented with small red ribbons, tied round their necks), that the saints may bless them with fatness, and preserve them from the maladies to which they are subject. As soon as all these creatures, down to the smallest chickens, have paid their tribute to the church, a priest sprinkles them with holy water; and if it happens that some little pig is possessed by a devil, and is obstinate (of which there are many examples), he is forthwith exorcised. It is not only the lower classes who observe these ceremonies; the nobility of the highest rank adhere to them with scrupulous piety, and horses, caparisoned with magnificent harness, on which coats-of-arms are emblazoned, have some difficulty in procuring a place, although the street is very large. When a coachman or charioteer finds his animals obstinate, he menaces them with the indignation of St. Anthony, after which, and a few cuts with the whip, they are sure to go forward."

Now these things occasioned a triple loss: first, here was a loss of the money actually expended; secondly, here was a loss of time, and time, as Dr. Franklin says, is money; thirdly, here was a loss in the habits of industry; for a person who has sauntered away his time in these pilgrimages must have acquired such vagabond habits as would render him less qualified to preserve his ordinary avocation.

V. By the Reformation we have saved all the money we should otherwise have expended in decorating our churches.

Our Protestant churches are often expensively decorated;

but they bear no comparison to the costly decorations of a Popish church. Persons who have all their lives been in the habit of attending the church of England are struck with astonishment at entering the churches of Belgium, France, or Italy. Pictures and images are things that cost money, and not a little money either. The professional singers which are hired to chant the services must all be paid. Besides, there is the expense of incense, of wine, of wax candles, of lamps, of oil; but, instead of enumerating any further, I will quote De Souligny:—

"The tapers, wax candles, and oil that are spent in their foolish superstitions, as burning them before images, statues, hosties, and at funerals, &c., did formerly cost the kingdom of France, perhaps, eight or ten millions. I do not reckon here the incense which they burn to little purpose, because that is no great matter, and is grateful to the smell; neither do I take notice of the ornaments and raiment of their statues, images, and other idols, because they last long, nor of their mysterious vestments, adorned with fine lace, of linen, silver, or gold, or gold fringes, or embroidery with which their priests are decked, when they perform what they call divine service. Nor do I take notice of the great quantity of wine which is spent in their multitude of masses daily, because it nourishes those that drink it, nor yet of their wafers, or consecrated hosties that they keep, though it be so much flour lost; so that I content myself here only to reckon the loss of their tapers and oil, which I believe, including their loss of time in making or lighting their candles, and cleaning and lighting their lamps, amounts to eight or ten millions per annum.

"The expense of the wax is more perceptible to abundance of people than that of their oil, and especially to Protestants, who do not go often into the Popish churches, because they have seen a thousand times in the streets, and at the gates of the churches, prodigious quantities of great long tapers, flambeaux, and torches, burning all at once; whereas they do not so much see the consumption of the oil. But, on the contrary, the Papists will judge that the expense of the oil is

much greater, because they see in many churches ten, fifteen, or twenty lamps burning all at once night and day; and in truth I am of opinion that the expense of the oil is the greater. There are few churches, nay, even in the country, but what have two lamps; and in cities there are churches that have ten, fifteen, twenty lamps or above, continually burning, besides what are in monasteries, convents, and chapels, both in town and country.*

VI. By the Reformation we have saved all the money which would otherwise be expended in the habiliments of the clergy.

The late Robert Robinson, of Cambridge, calculated that the mere washing of surplices cost this country ten thousand pounds a year. But who can calculate what is the expense of all the garments worn by the Catholic priesthood? The splendour of their appearance, particularly on high festivals, excites the attention of every one. Let us take a single priest, and examine what additional garments he has above those of a Protestant minister; let us calculate the expense of this gorgeous dress, and then let us suppose that every minister throughout the country were attired in the same expensive way, and we shall find it will amount to a considerable sum. I am not sufficiently acquainted with these matters to say how much that sum would be; nor, perhaps, would it be easy to obtain accurate information. In former times some curious canons were made respecting the dress of the clergy, for which see Burn's Ecclesiastical Law, vol. iii. p. 191.

VII. By the Reformation we have saved all the money which would otherwise be paid for the sight of holy relics and other consecrated articles, and for miraculous cures thereby received.

I have already mentioned the enormous revenue which the Pope derived from this country, by sending hither these precious articles of sacred merchandise. The original cost of these articles was, however, comparatively trifling. When arrived, they were deposited in cathedrals and parish churches, and exhibited for money to the sight of the faithful.

* De Souligny.

"Another of their baits to fish for the people's money is, the holy relics, as they call them, in their churches, monasteries, and convents. And when the people's devotion grows cold for the old relics, they never fail of bringing new shrines, or boxes full of new and fresh, and ordinarily they say they come from holy Rome. It is well enough known, that oftentimes these relics are pieces of pasteboard, fashioned like bones; sometimes they are the real bones of a human creature, and sometimes of beasts, as it hath been often proved, the priests and monks making it the matter of their diversion to insult over the foolish credulity of the people in this impudent manner, and yet at the same time make them pay for seeing and touching those relics.

"There are many orders who sell little relics, that they say have been consecrated by the Pope, and beads that have touched some miraculous images: the Carmelites have what they call the apparel of the Virgin, &c.

"There are also miracles to be performed from time to time, when the priests and monks please, by the statues, images, or bones of some dead man or woman, under the name of relics, or shrines of some saints, as they call the bones and boxes in which they keep them. Those miracles are of great advantage to the clergy; for, by this means, they bring abundance of offerings to their churches and chapels.

"Another method made use of by the ecclesiastics to catch the wealth and substance of the people is, their indulgences, which they obtain of the Pope from time to time for some churches or monasteries, which, whosoever visits during such a number of days, serve as a fair, or so many market days to the place, shall infallibly receive a pardon of all their sins, provided they give bountifully also to the said church or monastery, for that is always to be understood, and there are very few but what give more or less in such cases."*

"Relics, Agnus Dei's, crosses, pictures, beads, swords, bracelets, feathers, roses, shoes, boots, parings of nails, drops of milk, drops of blood, hair, medals, ashes, dust, rags, chips,

* De Souligny.

consecrated wax, and innumerable other hallowed knacks come next into play; and by these the people were constantly gulled out of their money: for these were daily brought over from Rome, and bargained for gold and silver—a cheat practised, to my knowledge, upon many devotees at this day.

"Such virtue was imputed to them, that scarce any that had money would stick to give the rates set upon them, especially when it was given out and believed they had power and virtue to fortify against temptation, infuse and strengthen grace, fight and drive away the devil, and all evil spirits, allay winds and tempests, purify the air, secure from thunder and lightning, stop all raging infections and contagions, and be as Panpharmacons against all diseases, with a multitude more benefits and advantages they brought to the possessors of them. All which, I say, being considered, who would be without such precious things when they might be had for money? Besides, it always was (as was but reasonable) in the Pope's power to set his own price upon his own commodities, as best knowing the virtue and value of them. And then, such hallowed things, the dearer they were, the better and more virtual they were esteemed."*

"The consideration of the nature and use of these relics, together with the saints to whom they were affirmed to have belonged, the miracles and cures said to be wrought by them, and also the indulgences, unriddle to me a certain difficulty which has puzzled divers to give a satisfactory reason for; and that is why the livings in London were anciently esteemed of so great value, and so highly rated in the king's books for first-fruits and tenths, when it is well known the tithes and church dues there are very small and inconsiderable compared to the country livings, whose certain profits, by reason of the predial tithes, far outstrip those of London. And certainly, this was the reason, because every church in London was furnished either with some famous saint, some precious relic, some gracious indulgences, some wonderful miracle, or some other *pia fraus*, whereby and

* The Romish Horse Leech, p. 70.

whereunto people were continually enticed to be supplicants and visitors with their vows and offerings. As at one church was a saint celebrated for giving easy travail to big-bellied women; another gave safety to merchants and mariners in their sea voyages; here was a cure for such a disease, and there for another, so that at every church there was something virtual and peculiar to draw customers and profit to the priests.

"But, then, at the Reformation, when all these cheats were detected and exploded, and the churches cleared of them, and the priests reduced to their standing legal revenues of tithes and church dues, then all those city livings fell so low that the parish dues respectively proved too small to maintain one priest; and thereupon the King and State thought good to make provision by a decree, confirmed by act of parliament, that the parsons and ministers of London should have a maintenance by the payment of the sum of two shillings and ninepence out of every twenty shillings per annum, rent of houses, shops, &c., without which they could not have subsisted."*

VIII. By the Reformation we have saved all the money which would otherwise have been expended in bacchanalian festivals and splendid processions.

"In the ridiculous festivals that they observe, the poor idolatrous people lose their time, besides the debaucheries which this abuse occasions indispensably in Popish countries. Supposing there are above fifty working days lost in a year by festivals in general, without reckoning Sundays, and some remarkable festivals, that would be the sixth part of people's industry lost. We must also take notice, that besides those general festivals and holidays, there are many particular festivals, viz., those of every parish, who have their particular saints, whose image they adore, according to the doctrine of their councils; the festivals of saints for every profession, trade, and distemper; when they practise the like, the festivals of beasts or saints that are patrons of beasts, so that there is much above the sixth part of the people's time lost.

* Romish Horse Leech, p. 82.

These holidays debauch the people, teach them bad habits of idleness, drunkenness, and immodesty, which hinder them from working on other days, ruin their families, occasion abundance of disorders, quarrels, diseases, fires, and the death of many people. In effect, as men do generally use those days, they look more like as if they were consecrated to the devil than to God. Masters suffer very much by this libertinism of their servants and apprentices; and the poor wives at home are grieved to consider that their husbands are at the public-houses, where they spend all that they had gained in several days, and will come home drunk, and perhaps beat them into the bargain.

"If it be pretended that men work the better, and are the more vigorous the days after the festival, because they have had some rest, that may be true as to some of the honest people; but as for the greatest part, it hath a contrary effect; their idleness and debauchery make them lose those days, and many others; and if all of them do not debauch themselves on those days, they spend them in races and unprofitable walks, which fatigue them more than their ordinary work; and to those who are of a regular temper, these holidays are perfectly irksome. I am really of opinion, that the disorders above mentioned, which are the result of or inseparably annexed to those festivals, do almost as much mischief as the holidays themselves; and experience shows us, daily, that there is much more insolence and disorder committed on one holiday than on three others; and most masters of shops in towns complain that they cannot find journeymen to work the day after holidays, the rabble usually disordering themselves on those holidays, that they cannot work the day after.

"Besides, they lose abundance of time in shrieving or confessing themselves, and at their anniversary days, Ash-Wednesday, &c., and by carrying their pretended sacrament or god about every day, by four persons at a time, besides the priest, who holds it in his hand; and this is, perhaps, in fifty places at once; in some great cities they lose, also, abundance of time in their daily masses. They have, moreover, their

private masses for the cure of their cattle, at which every one who is interested is obliged to assist. They lose, also, abundance of time in their Ambarvalia or Rogation weeks, by which they think to procure rain, or divert boisterous seasons when they threaten their corn.

"They plunder the people, also, by their tapers, wax candles, and torches, which they use in grand processions; for they oblige the people to furnish those things, and all that is not spent belongs, as they allege, to the church, that is to say, to the priests or monks. It is well enough known that, on certain days, which they look upon as great festivals, they oblige every corporation or company in great towns to furnish huge torches, each of which does sometimes represent a history of the Old and New Testament, or fabulous legend, or sometimes they will have the images of five or six persons, or as many beasts in wax at large, so weighty that they must have ten or twelve men to carry one of these torches. Twenty such they carry in procession, which costs more, sometimes, than ten or twenty thousand livres, and the profit of this is to be reaped by their clergy, at the expense of the poor idolatrous people.

IX. By the Reformation we have escaped all the evils in which we should have been involved by the rigid observance of Lent, and other seasons of fasting. These seasons were, before the Reformation, more strictly observed than at present. According to De Souligny, they produced the following evil effects:—

"1. By this means great sums of money are exported out of the kingdom for dry and fresh cod, stockfish, white and red herrings, salmon, pilchards, sardines, &c. It is certain, that formerly there were several millions,—above six, at least,—went out of the kingdom every year for fish.

"2. It prevents the breeding of many cattle of all sorts, and likewise of fowl in the kingdom, because the people dare not eat any flesh, which by necessary consequence diminishes the revenues of land. This want of cattle makes meat dear to those employed in manufactories and other handicrafts, as also to merchants, whom it costs a great deal dearer to

victual their ships. It likewise occasions the dearness of candles, butter, cheese, hides, wool, &c., in a country, which is a hindrance to mechanics and trade, and makes other provisions dearer in general than in those countries where that supersitition is unknown. It particularly occasions the dearness of bread; because the people, for want of flesh-meat, are obliged to eat abundance of bread. This want of cattle occasions, also, the laying out of great sums in foreign rice, hides, suet, butter, cheese, and fat, or grease for coaches and other carriages.

"3. It is the cause of maladies and distempers, languishings, and of the death of an infinite number of poor people, and of infirm, aged, and scrupulous persons, to whom meat would be more proper than anything else; and yet they cannot have that relief, because of the scruples that the idolatrous priests have formed in their minds, so that they suffer extremely during that time, and abundance more people die in that season than in others.

"4. This superstitious Lent falls, likewise, precisely out at a time when the husbandmen and other country people labour very hard about digging their vines, dunging their ground, sowing their March corn, and manuring their gardens, so that the peasants are in much the worse condition to work; that they are ill fed, not being allowed to eat flesh meat, and their garden-stuff being many times spoiled by the hard frosts of winter.

"5. Besides this, the Lent falls just at the end of the winter, when the poor sickly and ancient people have suffered more than they do ordinarily at other seasons; and instead of recovering strength as they would, or might do, were they allowed to eat such good meat as the season affords, as fresh eggs, lamb, veal, kids, pig, &c., instead of that the Lent completes their ruin, and kills them.

"6. Lent, and their other pretended fast-days, and their monks and nuns, that never eat flesh, destroy all the fish in the rivers without a possibility of being stocked again; nay, they hinder those of the very ponds from coming to maturity, or a competent growth.

"7. It occasions abundance of people to lose their time by fishing in those rivers, without almost catching anything, because they will have fish, and can have no other but such.

"8. Lent occasions the loss of the advantage and income of eggs, which are good at that time, and they do not know what use to put them to; and after Lent they are either too old, or of no value.

"9. The country people throughout the whole kingdom lose abundance in the time of Lent, of what they might reap from their calves, lambs, kids, pigs, and other young animals that are bred during that time, and have for the most part need of the milk of their dams; for either the peasants must dispense with the want of that milk which does highly incommode them, or else they must throw parts of those creatures to the dogs. They lose, also, by their poultry, which they can neither eat nor sell, and yet must keep them, though many times they have not corn to feed them; so the country people do many times lose part of their great and small cattle by the Lent; for if the winter be long, and the spring backward, and they have not gathered abundance of forage the year foregoing, their cattle die of hunger, which would not be, if they were either allowed to sell them to the butcher, or to eat them themselves.

"10. The peasants, not daring to eat neither flesh nor eggs, because they are forbid to eat them under the notion of a great sin, and having no fish to eat, because it is scarce and dear, nor roots, nor herbs, because the winter has destroyed them, they are obliged to maintain themselves by the milk of their cows, which occasions their calves being starved, and is partly the cause why the cattle are so poor in France, and this occasions an incredible prejudice to the kingdom.

"11. Lent and other fast-days, which the priests command them to observe, on pain of eternal damnation, makes them disrelish and loath all sea and shell fish; and are the cause that there are fewer mariners and fishers than otherwise there would be, because people do, without comparison, eat abundance less of sea-fish than otherwise they would do; and by

this means the kingdom loses a great advantage, and an inestimable revenue which nature presents to them, without trouble and charge. In those places at a great distance from the sea, if it were not for the superstition of Lent, and other fast-days, as they call them in those places, they would eat much more meat than they do, and more also than is eaten on the sea-coasts where fish is more plentiful and cheaper, and, consequently, they should breed more cattle. More fish would also be eaten in the sea-ports, and other places near the sea, than is eaten at present, if it were not for the tyrannous imposition upon their consciences, which forbids them to eat meat at such times, and creates in most of them a kind of abhorrency of fish, which they are forced to eat; and hence it comes to pass, that less fish is taken in the sea-ports than there would be, were it not for this superstition, and less cattle is also bred in the country.

"12. It is a shame to human nature to see those excesses which the poor idolatrous Papists are guilty of during the time of the carnival, when they conceive they have a privilege to dishonour, violate, and degrade their nature by all sorts of infamy, excess, and disorders, and by their masquerades, and changing the habit of their sex to make themselves amends for being condemned by their priests to eat no flesh during Lent; and when that is over, they believe themselves authorized again to commit the like riots at Easter, which is so much the more dangerous to the health of many people, that they fed slenderly before, in hopes of being sooner delivered from the fire of purgatory after death.

"13. There is more counterfeit devotion in Lent than at other times, which exhausts the purses, and wastes the time of these poor ignorant people. I say nothing of those monstrous opinions, unworthy of God and man, which these base and foolish superstitions do nourish and maintain, as if it were more pleasing to God to see people eat fish and pulse, than to eat flesh, and at one time rather than another. I say I will not speak of those things here, for that belongs more to divines than to me. For all these reasons above mentioned, and others, I make no scruple to say, that the keeping of

Lent does above fifty millions of livres prejudice to the kingdom of France per annum."*

X. By the Reformation, we have saved all the money which would otherwise have been given to the mendicant friars. These friars lived by begging, and are different from the monks who lived in monasteries which were richly endowed.

"Mendicant friars, in particular, are a very great charge to the kingdom, all of them being absolutely needless; whereas, among the secular clergy, the bishops, with a few canons, curates, and priests, are necessary, and fit enough for the ordinary service of the church. And those begging friars are so much the more intolerable than the endowed monasteries, as by their voluntary begging and laziness, they are very chargeable to the people who maintain them richly one way or another: for ordinarily they eat the best, and drink abundance of wine, whilst many honest people who are useful subjects in the kingdom, have much ado to get bread by their labour. Those wretched monks are also highly injurious to the real poor, who are robbed of so much alms as those idle bellies receive. It is supposed there are above 60,000 of those monks in the kingdom: let us reckon, then, that they cost the kingdom but 6*d.* a-piece per day, one with another, that will exceed six millions of livres per annum. This is the least they spend; for most part of them live in good cities or towns, where they fare deliciously, but take care as much as they can to conceal their good cheer, because that would prevent the people's giving them so much. I have several times seen divers spits full of choice pullets, venison, and wild-fowl, roasting for them in by-houses (at a little distance from their convents), where the people followed that way of living, and they would tell me, that those things were sent out of charity to the good fathers." †

XI. By the Reformation, we have saved all the money which otherwise we should have been tricked out of by the frauds of the clergy.

"Every age has cried out against the frauds of the Roman

* De Souligny. † Ibid.

Catholic clergy. I know it will be said, that it is very unjust to charge on a whole class of men the crimes of individuals. But these frauds have been practised so frequently, and by such numerous bodies of the clergy, that I am justified in considering them as inseparably connected with the system of Popery. Indeed, the priests and monks have such means of practising imposition with impunity, that it is, perhaps, too much to expect from human nature to suppose they will abstain from doing so when they can replenish their own coffers, and at the same time promote, as they imagine, the interests of religion. Numerous exposures of these frauds took place at the Reformation: they discovered many impostures about relics and wonderful images, to which pilgrimages had been wont to be made. At Reading they had an angel's wing, which brought over the spear's point that pierced our Saviour's side! As many pieces of the cross were found as, joined together, would have made a big cross. The Rood of Grace, at Boxley, in Kent, had been much esteemed, and had drawn many pilgrims to it: it was observed to bow and roll its eyes, and look at times well pleased or angry, which the credulous multitude imputed to a Divine power; but all this was discovered to be a cheat, and it was brought up to St. Paul's Cross, and all the springs were openly showed that governed its several motions. At Hailes, in Gloucestershire, the blood of Christ was showed in a phial, and it was believed that none could see it who were in mortal sin, and so, after good presents were made, the deluded pilgrims went away as well satisfied as if they had seen it. This was the blood of a duck, renewed every week, put in a phial very thick on one side, and as thin on the other, and either side turned towards the pilgrim as the priests were satisfied with their oblations. Several other such like impostures were discovered, which contributed much to the undeceiving the people."* And are not these impositions still continued? What are the extravagant falsehoods that are related of bits of bones, and of cloths, the relics of pretended saints, but impositions? What but impositions collected together, a short time ago, at Aix-la-

* Burnet's Abridgment of the Reformation, p. 200.

Chapelle, forty thousand people to see some hallowed vestments of the Virgin Mary? What but imposition caused the following exhibition to be made to a stranger at Sens? "After showing me a great many skulls and jaw-bones of different saints, he showed me a piece of the real cross that had been obtained at great expense of pains from the Holy Land. This was handsomely mounted in silver, and in the shape of a diminutive cross. But a still greater curiosity he had to come, he said, pulling out a small oblong ivory box, and then with great care opening its lid, and showing me, sewed on to a richly adorned little velvet cushion, a very small bone of the prophet Isaiah."* Now will you maintain that all the legends which are palmed on the populace about these pretended relics are really believed by the priests, the gentry, and the educated people of Catholic countries? If they do not themselves believe them, are they not guilty of gross imposition in pretending that they do? And if they do believe them, are we degraded by the Reformation, which has delivered us from a religion under the influence of which the understanding becomes so besotted?

Here let us take our pen in hand, and calculate how much money, in case the Reformation had not occurred, we should now have to pay to the Church for all the particular items I have enumerated, in addition to what we at present pay for tithes and surplice fees; and then let us inquire in what way our *not* paying this additional sum tends to impoverish us.

CONSTITUTIONAL LIBERTY.

I HAVE already pointed out the principal direct methods by which Popery impoverished and degraded the main body of the people in this country. But these formed only a part of the evil. There are various indirect ways, by which the same effects were produced. The political institutions to which Popery gave rise—the exaltation of the ecclesiastical over the

* John Cobbett's Letter from France, p. 162.

civil power—the tyranny of the priesthood—the enslaving doctrines which were inculcated—and the subjection of this kingdom to a foreign power: all tended to degrade the minds of the people, and to prevent their attainment to that degree of happiness which they have since enjoyed.

1. Popery destroys that vigour of the mind in which consists the excellence of national character.

The belief in the infallibility of the Pope, or that of the Church (for Papists are not agreed on this subject), destroys all freedom of inquiry, and necessarily introduces that abjectness of mind which a slave entertains towards his tyrant. Nor is this imbecility confined merely to religious subjects. It is a remark of Dr. Robertson's,* that "the active powers of the human mind, when roused to vigorous exertion in one line, are most capable of operating with force in other directions." In the same way, when the mind is depressed by any one cause, the effects of that depression will be visible in all its operations. The principal evil of slavery does not consist in being liable to have our property taken away, our notions circumscribed, or our persons confined; but in that cowardly abjectness of spirit which it produces, and which disqualifies for every noble enterprise. Such an effect must be produced on the mind of every one who is taught to tremble at the anathemas of a priest, and to embrace the greatest absurdities on pain of eternal punishment.

The gross absurdity of the tenets imposed tends to increase this mental imbecility. What shall we say of transubstantiation? What shall we say of the legends of the saints, and of the sacred relics which are even in our day exhibited in Italy, France, and Belgium? What shall we say of the miracles of Prince Hohenloe? What shall we say when monarchs are washing the feet of children on Holy Thursday, or in weaving garments for the Virgin Mary? Surely, when a man is brought to believe and practise things like those, there is an end to all independence of spirit; and as a nation is composed of individuals, there is no foundation for national greatness.

* Disquisition on India, p. 90.

Few things have had a more beneficial influence on the intellectual character of society than religious controversy. It rouses the most strenuous exertions; it appeals directly to the reason, and calls on every man to judge. It has distinguished every era of the Christian Church that has been remarkable for intellectual vigour. But these advantages are altogether excluded from Popery. Heretical books must not be examined; nay, even the Bible, the standard of truth, must not be read. The creed of the faithful is already prescribed, and woe to the culprit who questions the accuracy of the decision. Disputes have indeed occasionally arisen in the Romish church. Among the most violent of these has been the question whether the Virgin Mary was or was not born without sin? These disputes have, however, been always confined to ecclesiastics, who have conducted them in a language not generally understood, and in a way that tended more to barbarize than to enlighten their followers.

Those nations who have thrown off the shackles of Papal domination have been more distinguished by intellectual energy than the Popish countries. What a degree of commercial enterprise has characterized England and Holland! what a spirit of industry pervades their inhabitants! how commerce and agriculture thrive! what immense improvements are made in the external condition of these countries! what stupendous exertions can they make against a foreign foe! Even the colonies of Popish and Protestant countries feel the effects of their religion. What a contrast is presented by the South American colonies of Spain, and those colonies of Great Britain which now form the United States of North America!

It must be acknowledged that individuals have arisen in Popish countries who have astonished the world with the grandeur of their minds. In all countries there are many persons who will profess the established religion, without examining its claims or imbibing its spirit. Those bright geniuses have not been devotees: they have never drunk deeply into the spirit of the religion they professed; on the contrary, they have generally been suspected of a want of attachment

to the Catholic faith, and in many cases the zealots were their avowed enemies. The nature of a religion must be learned, not from the conduct of a few individual professors, but from the influence it produces on the mass of the population. Those illustrious individuals whose brightness has for a moment gilded the gloomy horizon of Popery, so far from exhibiting its influence, have served only, by the contrast they formed, to render more palpable the darkness by which they were encircled.

2. Popery breathes a persecuting spirit. The doctrine of exclusive salvation within the bosom of the Church, and the condemnation of all heretics to eternal perdition, necessarily diminish that expansive benevolence which is most opposed to a spirit of persecution. When we have deliberately consigned the soul to perdition, the man is justly considered as having little else worthy of compassion.

The celibacy of the clergy produces a contractedness of heart which fosters moroseness of temper and cruelty of disposition. Men who have passed their lives in stern and perpetual warfare against the feelings of humanity have little inclination to compassionate the weaknesses of others; and knowing nothing of those tender emotions which vibrate through the bosom of a husband and a father, they feel none of those exquisite pleasures which arise from the social character of man. This unfeeling disposition increases by solitude or abstraction from the active pursuits of life. Hence of all Papists the most intolerant are the ecclesiastics; and of all ecclesiastics, the most intolerant are the monks.

The intimate union of the Roman Catholic clergy naturally induces them to act in concert for the benefit of their order: their connection with a foreign power renders them less interested in the prosperity of the country in which they dwell; and by means of confession, they have immense facilities for carrying into execution any plan for the destruction of civil or religious liberty. To be able to influence an individual, it is only necessary to become intimately acquainted with him, to know his failings and his propensities, and what motives will operate most powerfully on his mind. Here behold the

mighty power of the priesthood; every individual must unbosom himself to a priest. These priests are bound together by the strongest ties, are separated from the rest of mankind by the vow of celibacy, and acknowledge for their head the sovereign of a foreign state, who, by means of ecclesiastical promotions, cardinals' caps, and titles of honour, is able to command their services, and stimulate their exertions.

3. Popery is injurious to civil and religious liberty. That liberty is essential to national prosperity, to that kind of prosperity which includes the happiness of the people, is a proposition that in our time requires no proof; and it is equally certain that this liberty fades and languishes when brought within the reach of the pestiferous breath of Popery.

In every age, and in all countries, the extent of liberty actually enjoyed is in an inverse ratio to the influence of the priesthood. That abjectness of mind which is produced by spiritual domination will easily acquiesce in the dictates of civil tyranny. When a man believes in the infallibility of the Pope, he may easily be induced to subscribe to the divine right of kings. No priesthood ever made stronger pretensions to public veneration than that of the Church of Rome. They array themselves in all the pomp of external magnificence. So pure is their character, that celibacy is the only state that can correspond with their sanctity. Forgiveness of sins can be obtained only by their means; to them the secrets of the heart must be revealed; from baptism to burial their assistance is necessary, and after death it is they alone who can offer up mass for the repose of the soul.

This gigantic influence can find a solid basis only on the ignorance of the people. Hence it has always been directed against the exercise of civil liberty, which would tend to enlighten the mind and reform the heart. That independence of spirit which is produced by freedom, would be dangerous to the interests of superstition. Hence those patriots and philanthropists who have arisen to assert the rights of humanity, have always had to contend against the influence of the Church. The constitution of the Papal hierarchy being despotic and claiming absolute submission, its members have

been led, by a sympathy of feeling and a similarity of manners, to range themselves on the side of despotic governments. The Church has ever been anxious to acquire wealth, and her members have always had the sagacity to perceive that more advantages are to be obtained by siding with the oppressors than with the oppressed. Hence Popery and despotism have been associated together, passive obedience on the part of the people being essential to each.

It is true, the influence of the Church has sometimes been opposed to the State. When the property of the Church has been assailed, her sensibilities have been remarkably acute respecting the rights and liberties of man. But, although the Church of Rome has sometimes employed her influence in raising factions against existing authorities, it has not been on account of their encroachments on the liberty of the nation, but because they have endeavoured to reform the abuses of the ecclesiastics. The greatest tyrants, when they have been the friends of the Holy See, have always received its support, while the most patriotic monarchs have been exposed to its thunders, when they have attempted to reform the manners or abridge the wealth of the priesthood.

4. If we take a view of the history of our country, we shall meet with abundant facts to confirm these observations.

The Papists boast that our Saxon ancestors received Christianity from the Popes. Admitting this to be true, it may be questioned whether, politically considered, the condition of the main body of the people was at any time much improved by that corrupt Christianity which was introduced by the Popes. And certainly, in the end, it led to the overthrow of the Saxon constitution. The Popish missionaries who came hither as the teachers of Christianity had the means of conferring immense advantages on the country. They might have civilized the people—they might have taught them many useful arts, and, by extending the principles of Christianity, might have promoted the happiness and greatness of the nation. But what did they do? What sort of system was introduced by these successors of the apostles? Let us hear what Mr. Hume says of this happy epoch.

"Even Christianity, though it opened the way to connections between them and the more polished states, had not hitherto been very effectual in banishing their ignorance, or softening their manners. As they received that doctrine through the corrupted channels of Rome, it carried along with it a great mixture of credulity and superstition, equally destructive to the understanding and to morals; the reverence towards saints and relics seems to have almost supplanted the adoration of the Supreme Being; monastic observances were esteemed more meritorious than the active virtues; the knowledge of natural causes was neglected, from the universal belief of miraculous interpositions and judgments; bounty to the Church atoned for every violence against society; and the remorses for cruelty, murder, treachery, assassination, and the more robust vices, were appeased, not by amendment of life, but by penances, servility to the monks, and an abject and illiberal devotion. The reverence for the clergy had been carried to such a height that, wherever a person appeared in a sacerdotal habit, though on the highway, the people flocked around him and showing him all the marks of profound respect, received every word he uttered as the most sacred oracle. Even the military virtues, so inherent in all the Saxon tribes, began to be neglected; and the nobility, preferring the security and sloth of the cloister to the tumults and glory of war, valued themselves chiefly on endowing monasteries, of which they assumed the government. The several kings, too, being extremely impoverished by continual benefactions to the Church, to which the states of their kingdom had weakly assented, could bestow no rewards on valour or military services, and retained not even sufficient influence to support their government. Another inconvenience which attended this corrupt species of Christianity was the superstitious attachment to Rome, and the gradual subjection of the kingdom to a foreign jurisdiction. The Britons having never acknowledged any subordination to the Roman Pontiff, had conducted all ecclesiastical government by their domestic synods and councils; but the Saxons, receiving their religion

from Roman monks, were taught, at the same time, a profound reverence for that see, and were naturally led to regard it as the capital of their religion. Pilgrimages to Rome were represented as the most meritorious acts of devotion. Not only noblemen and ladies of rank undertook this tedious journey, but kings themselves, abdicating their crowns, sought for a secure passport to heaven at the feet of the Roman Pontiff. New reliques, perpetually sent from that endless mint of superstition, and magnified by lying miracles invented in convents, operated on the astonished minds of the multitude; and every prince has attained the eulogies of the monks, the only historians of those ages, not in proportion to his civil and military virtues, but to his devoted attachment towards their order, and his superstitious reverence for Rome.

"Had this abject superstition produced general peace and tranquillity, it had made some atonement for the ills attending it; but besides the usual avidity of men for power and riches, frivolous controversies in theology were engendered by it, which were so much the more fatal as they admitted not, like the others, of any final determination from established possession."*

Admitting, therefore, that the Saxons would never have been converted to Christianity had it not been for the Popes, what advantage did they confer on the main body of the people? Could any system of idolatry be worse than such a system as this, or have a more pernicious influence on the prosperity of the country? But I do not make this admission. I do not admit that if the Popish missionaries had not visited this country that the Saxons would have remained idolators. The ancient Britons and the Scots had been converted to Christianity. They possessed a purer faith, and were altogether independent of the Roman see. By intercourse with them the Saxons probably would have become acquainted with the truths of Christianity, in the same way as their countrymen on the continent of Europe had become Christians. Had the Saxons received their Christianity from

* Hume's England, vol. i. p. 20.

the Ancient Britons and the Scots, they would have avoided the errors of the see of Rome, and would not have been in ecclesiastical subjection to a foreigner.

The influence of that sort of religion which was published by the Popes soon became apparent in the state of the country. The clergy having persuaded the king to become a Christian, the people too became Christians. By the example of the monarch, and by pretended miracles, the clergy soon acquired the veneration of the populace. Lent was established, monasteries were founded, plenty of rich lands were given to the priests, and tithes were instituted; and while the clergy were enjoying all these good things, they obtained for themselves an exemption from taxes, and other civil immunities. The clergy made such rapid strides to wealth and power that, even during the Saxon dynasty, they had sufficient influence to raise a rebellion against King Edwy, because he had married within the prohibited degrees of relationship. The clergy were successful, and the beautiful queen was divorced from her husband; barbarously deprived of her charms, by passing red-hot irons over her face, and subsequently put to death.

To the increase of the clergy, priests, and monks is attributed the success of the Danes.* The stout young fellows who should have borne arms in defence of their country had become monks, and were employed in reciting paternosters and counting beads; and the revenues, which should have been employed in paying soldiers, had been lavished upon monasteries; and hence but feeble resistance could be made against the Danish invaders. "Indeed one may safely affirm, that the multitude of monasteries invited the invasion, and facilitated the conquest of the Danes over England, and that in a double respect; First, Because not only the fruit of the king's exchequer (I mean ready money) was spent by this king's predecessors on founding of monasteries, but also the *root* thereof (his demesne lands), plucked up and parted with to endow the same, whereby the sinews of war were

* Brady's History of England.—Henry's History of England, vol. ii. p. 526, 4to.—Fuller's Church History.

wanting to make effectual opposition against foreign enemies. Secondly, Because England had at this time more flesh or fat than bones wherein the strength of the body consists, more monks than military men. For instance, Holy Island, near Northumberland, is sufficiently known for a possession thereof, an advantageous landing-place, especially in relation to Denmark. This place was presently forsaken of the fearful monks, frighted with the approach of Danes; and Aldhunus, the bishop thereof, removed his cathedral and convent to Durham, an inland place of more safety. Now, had there been a castle instead of a monastery, to secure the same with fighters instead of feeders; men-of-arms instead of men of bellies, therein, probably they might have stopped the Danish invasion at the first inlet thereof; England, then, as much wanted martial men as since it hath been surfeited with too many of them." *

The Norman Conquest, too, was unquestionably brought about by the Popish religion. At this period, one-third of the lands of the kingdom was in the hands of the clergy—the minds of the people were enervated by superstition; but besides this, William Duke of Normandy had the sanction of the Pope; and therefore the clergy of England had conscientious scruples about the justice of opposing him. Hence this Norman became the master of England, and dire were the consequences to the nation. The Saxon institutions were overthrown; the feudal system (a system of wretchedness and oppression) became established in their stead. A separation was made between the secular and the ecclesiastical courts; † all legal proceedings were conducted in the French language; game laws were introduced, and whole districts turned into forests for the royal amusement; the common people trampled upon, and compelled to put out their lights at eight o'clock in the evening; the nobles were stung into resistance, and then sent to the block; the English Church became completely subjected to the See of Rome; the celibacy of the

* This occurred A.D. 994, when Ethelred was King. See Fuller's Church History of Britain, book ii. p. 211.

† Blackstone's Commentaries, book iv. ch. 33.

clergy was strictly enforced; the richest benefices were filled with foreigners, some of whom never came into the country; while the Pope, by a thousand ways, derived, nearly for five centuries, an enormous revenue, levied on the people of England. During this period, too, the country was visited with all the horrors of nearly thirty rebellions and civil wars.* Perpetual collisions were taking place between the civil and the ecclesiastical authorities. Levies of men and money were raised by authority of the Pope, for crusades against the Turks and other heretics; and at the epoch of the Reformation, the English had lost all the provinces they had formerly possessed in France, and retained only the town of Calais, and even that was taken from us under the reign of the bigoted Mary. Nothing is more easy than to point out the dreadful evils which were produced by Popery upon the civil and religious liberty, the morals, the wealth, the political power, and the intellectual energy of this country.

The Popish king, William the Conqueror, introduced the feudal system. From the Conquest, down to almost the time of the Reformation, that is, for nearly five hundred years, "the main body of the people" were slaves; yes, absolutely slaves, attached to the soil, and transferred, like cattle, at the pleasure of their masters. Now let us mind that during the whole of this period, in which the main body of the people were slaves, the Popish religion was the only religion in the country. I am not going to contend that the feudal system was abolished by the Reformation, I know this was not the case. I know that the feudal system was abolished, or nearly abolished, a short time previous to the Reformation; and I know, too, that this system was abolished in France, without the Protestant Reformation. But the fact is unaltered. The fact is that, before the Reformation, the main body of the people were slaves; and we cannot prove that they were better off then than they are now, unless we prove that slavery is better than liberty.

But during this period all the people were not slaves; there were some free men; and these free men resisted the

* Aspin's Chronology.

tyranny of some of our kings. In these contests the Popes and the clergy took the side which most befriended their own interests, but never did they promote the liberty of the main body of the people. When the barons had compelled King John to sign Magna Charta, the Pope issued a bull against it.* In other cases, when a tyrannical sovereign had sworn that in future he would respect the liberties of the people, the Pope absolved him from his oaths. Such was the case, not only with John, but also with Henry III.,† and several other of our monarchs. How hostile to the spirit of liberty must be that religion which will absolve from his oath a king who has sworn to maintain the free constitutions of his country, and will thus quiet his conscience, while he perpetrates acts of the most odious tyranny! It is worthy of remark, that while the Popes were thus opposed to all the efforts of liberty on the part of the people, they assumed the most despotic power to themselves. The Pope gave England to William I. and gave Ireland to Henry II. Afterwards, he gave England to the son of the King of France, when John, to avoid the evil, gave his kingdom to the Pope. The Pope now again became the defender of England, and threatened to excommunicate the King of France if he presumed to attack it. In the succeeding reign, the Pope gave Sicily to the son of Henry III.,‡ in consequence of which, this country was involved in a ruinous war to gain possession of that island. For when the Pope gave kingdoms, he always left the persons to whom he gave them to make the conquests themselves. He never gave away kingdoms of which he was actually in possession. It is remarkable that our most stupid and imbecile monarchs were those who were most devoted to the See of Rome. Such were John, Henry III., and Richard II.; while our most intellectual kings were most opposed to that See, as Henry II., Edward I., and Edward III. The reason is plain: those impotent monarchs were so thoroughly hated by their subjects, that they felt it necessary to call in the assistance of the Pope and the clergy to support their tyran-

* Hume's England, vol. i. p. 196. † Ib. p. 231.
‡ Ib. p. 224.

nical government. In such cases the Pope and the clergy were never backward in granting their aid, taking care only to extort from the needy monarch a good share of power and plunder for themselves.

The first act of the Reformation, by which the king was declared the head of the English church, gave a fatal blow to the influence of the Pope. No more money could he get from England: no more needy Italians could he appoint to English bishoprics: no more civil commotions could he excite by his influence over the clergy. From these, and a thousand other evils, the country was at once delivered. But even this act, important as it was in itself, was comparatively trifling. The clergy were still enormously rich, and had immense privileges. These privileges were restricted, and that wealth was diminished. Had the clergy retained all their property and immunities, they would still have been a formidable body in the State, capable of overawing the civil power. Even now, diminished as is the property of the Church of England, no statesman would dare to bring forward a measure that should directly interfere with church property; what immense influence would the clergy possess had they all the property which they enjoyed before the Reformation!

The effect which the seizure of Church property had upon political liberty was abundantly evident in the civil wars of Charles I. In these wars the clergy took the side of the monarch. Had they possessed the wealth they formerly possessed, had they possessed all the lands which had been taken from the monasteries and the bishoprics, by Henry, Edward, and Elizabeth, Charles could not have been otherwise than successful. A despotic power would then have been established in this country, and under Charles II. Popery would probably have been restored.

5. The Reformation has promoted civil liberty, not only by diminishing the influence of the clergy, but by that independent feeling it has produced in the minds of the people.

It was this feeling of independence which, at the abolition of the feudal system, erected a bulwark against despotic

power.* Henry VIII. was the most absolute monarch that ever filled the British throne. And why? Was it because he had greater abilities than any of his predecessors? No; it was because he was free from those restraints to which they were subjected. Under the feudal system the royal authority was checked by the power of the great barons. But Henry VII., by permitting the barons to alienate their estates, had destroyed their power. The large estates were now broken up into a thousand pieces; the proprietors were too numerous to unite, and too feeble to resist, singly, the power of the crown. Heretofore two or three great barons, with their retainers and vassals, were a pretty good match for the king; but now the case was altered, and consequently Henry VIII. became an absolute monarch. The only check, then, to the power of the crown was the parliament. And what sort of a parliament was it? At that time the members of parliament were poor men, sent thither at the expense of their constituents, and had neither the wealth nor the courage sufficient to resist the encroachments of royalty. The parliaments of Henry VIII. were proverbially obsequious. In the reign of Edward VI. the parliament voted for the abolition of Popery. On the accession of Mary, they voted for the re-establishment of Popery; and when Elizabeth came to the throne, they voted for the abolition of Popery again. Henry threatened a member of the House of Commons that he would take off his head if a certain bill were not passed the next day; and Elizabeth repeatedly sent members to prison for using too great a liberty of speech. All this shows that the power of the crown was absolute; and if it was necessary to produce another proof that it was so, it would be the act of the parliament themselves, by which it was enacted that the king's proclamation should have the force of law.†

Here, then, it is obvious, that had it not been for the Reformation, we must have had a despotic government. On the destruction of the great barons, England became a despotism.

* Blackstone's Commentaries, vol. iv. p. 435.

† Hume, vol. i. p. 563.

No check remained to the royal power but the parliament, and they were too feeble to resist; and had they even been stung into resistance as they were in the reign of Charles I., that resistance could not have been successful, as the immense property and influence of the clergy would have been on the side of the monarch. But the Reformation erected in the minds of the people a barrier to tyranny. Having been instructed to contend for the rights of conscience, they learned to contend for other rights; hence they silently, and sometimes successfully opposed in the parliament the measures of the crown. Their cause gathered strength as the people became better instructed, and when at length tyranny, impatient of restraint, appealed to the sword, liberty became triumphant. Even Hume, though he has drawn an unfair portraiture of the Puritans, acknowledges that to them we are indebted for our free institutions. It is true that the civil wars, as is always the case, gave rise to a temporary military despotism, but nevertheless the seeds of liberty took root in the minds of the people, and ultimately produced the glorious revolution of 1688.

In proving that the Reformation prevented this country falling under a despotic government, I might gather abundant evidence from the histories of France and Spain. The same causes which abolished the feudal system in England abolished the same system in those countries. What was the result? In both countries the government became despotic. Both countries had their parliaments; but in Spain, this parliament, or cortes, was never permitted to assemble, and in France the parliaments were allowed merely a judicial authority. While the Huguenots, or Protestants, abounded in France, there was indeed a virtual, though not a constitutional, check to the royal power; but after they were banished by the revocation of the edict of Nantes, civil liberty was unknown in that country: both Spain and France, till the revolution of 1789, groaned beneath the double oppression of civil and ecclesiastical tyranny; and such must have been the case with England, had it not been for the glorious Reformation.

THE PREACHER;

OR,

ESSAYS ON PREACHING.

WITH AN APPENDIX ON THE DELIVERY OF ADDRESSES FROM THE PLATFORM.

[These Essays were, with some others, published anonymously in a religious periodical. The Author must be regarded as a spectator only of the scenes he describes; for in no one instance has he ever been a Preacher, and in very few has he delivered an address from the Platform.—J. W. G.]

CONTENTS.

THE PREACHER.

PAGE

I.—The Objects of Preaching 227
II.—The Effects of Preaching 230
III.—Apostolical Preaching 234
IV.—Textual Preaching 239
V.—On Reading Sermons 243
VI.—The Pulpit, the Bar, and the Senate 250
VII.—Female Preachers 259
VIII.—The Superiority of Preaching as a Means of imparting Religious Instruction to Unenlightened Nations—its Divine Authority 273
IX.—Ibid.—its Efficiency 281
X.—Ibid.—its Influence 293
XI.—Ibid.—its Adaptation 301

THE PLATFORM.

I.—Comparison between the Pulpit and the Platform . . . 307
II.—The Influence of the Platform 312
III.—The Imperfections of the Platform 320
IV.—The Constitution of Religious Societies 331
V.—The Administration of Religious Societies 341

THE PREACHER.

I.—THE OBJECTS OF PREACHING.

NOTHING exhibits the wisdom of the Divine Being more than the adaptation of the means he employs for the accomplishment of his designs. This principle, so obvious in all the works of Nature, is not less prominent in all the operations of grace; and were we desirous of selecting its brightest exemplification, perhaps we should fix on the appointment of preaching, to accomplish the designs of Jehovah in regard to the salvation of man. It is true that preaching, like every other means, must be dependent on Divine influence for success; but still we cannot fail to admire the wisdom manifested in the selection of this, as the principal means of building and enlarging His church.

The object of the Christian ministry is, to effect a total revolution in the moral character of man, to turn him from darkness to light, from the power of Satan unto God. The accomplishment of this design is produced by means perfectly compatible with the exercise of those natural faculties with which he is endowed.

1. The understanding must be informed. All our religious knowledge is derived from the Holy Scriptures. But though these sacred writings are generally so plain, that he who runs may read; though everything essential to human salvation is obvious to the plainest capacity, yet, in consequence of the sublime nature of their contents, in consequence of

frequent allusions to the circumstances of the times in which they were written, and in consequence of the idioms of the original tongues, there are heights and depths, there are difficulties and obscurities which genius and learning, application and study, are alone able to remove. The Christian minister devotes his time, his energy, and his talents to study the sacred volume. After acquiring those languages in which the dictates of Divine wisdom are recorded—after obtaining a knowledge of those arts and sciences connected with theology—after turning over the volumes written by the most learned men in every age and in every country—after comparing their statements, and maturing his own reflections, he passes from the study to the pulpit to communicate the result of his labours for the improvement of his people. He endeavours to remove some of the clouds by which the temple of revelation is obscured, and to present it to their view in all its majestic simplicity.

2. The judgment must be convinced. Preaching is not intended merely to explain the sacred volume: were this all, a printed commentary might be sufficient. Our religion is a system of truths founded on evidence. The doctrines of Christianity must be stated and vindicated; the objections advanced by Paganism, Judaism, or Deism must be refuted: the different errors which have arisen in the Christian church, and which have been supported by forced and unnatural constructions of the sacred word, must be dissipated; the apparent inconsistencies of the various parts of our religious system must be reconciled; and the citadel of truth must be surrouuded by bulwarks, impregnable to all the attacks of her assailants.

3. The conscience must be awakened. Whatever opinions philosophers or theologians may have entertained respecting the moral sense, there can be no doubt but that man is endowed with moral perceptions. It is true that, like all the other faculties of the mind, these powers are progressive, and are capable of being perverted; but this is no argument against their existence. It is the object of the Christian preacher to rectify these powers; to render the conscience

a faithful monitor, whose dictates shall direct us in the path of duty. For this purpose he portrays the character of man as a sinner, as a rebel against the authority of heaven, as an apostate from his Maker; he exhibits the awful denunciations of divine justice, and then he proclaims the pardon which the Gospel unfolds. He insists on the moral law as the rule of life, extending its requirements to the discipline of the mind, the correction of the desires, the examination of the motives, as well as the regulation of the language and the conduct; he detects vice in all its secret foldings around the human heart; he enforces the performance of all family and social duties, and thus he causes the moral virtues to bloom on the stock of evangelical religion.

4. The passions must be excited. In the greater part of our actions we are governed by passion rather than by judgment. To endeavour to reform mankind, by appealing to their feelings, after having appealed to their reason, is a fair and legitimate mode of persuasion. If it is the passions of mankind which drag them into vice, often in opposition to their judgment, is it not justifiable to employ those passions as the means of restoring men to virtue, and that too in compliance with the dictates of their judgment? Never had any public speaker such powerful means of persuasion as the Christian preacher. What motives can influence a being susceptible of pain and of pleasure, and guided by a principle of reason? Can the fear of punishment or the hope of reward? Can he be softened by kindness, or awed by danger? Can he be influenced by considerations of personal or of social bliss, by a regard for self-interest, or by gratitude to a benefactor? Can his heart be moved by time or eternity, by life or death, by heaven or hell? All these motives are found in the sacred volume, and the faithful preacher employs them all. On the one hand, he depicts the tumultuous agitations of the wicked, the horrors of the chamber of death, the thunders of Omnipotence, and a hell of eternal woes. On the other hand, he portrays the peaceful serenity of the man of God, his calm repose, the smiles of Deity, and a heaven of unfading bliss.

Thus the "messenger of truth" endeavours to renovate the character of man by appealing to his understanding and his judgment, his conscience and his passions. Under Divine influence, these appeals produce the mightiest effects. Self-righteousness throws aside her robes of arrogance, and stands a humble suppliant at the footstool of grace. Profligacy, clothed in decorum and restored to reason, listens to the instructions of heavenly wisdom. Misery dries up her tears, and looks with complacency on the lovely rosebud placed in her bosom by the hand of Hope. Avarice opens his hand to the claims of compassion. The rod of iron drops from the hand of Oppression. Revenge rushes to the altar of Concord, to swear forgiveness to her deadliest foe. Celestial Mercy, smiling with ineffable sweetness, sheds her splendour over the whole, and thus crowns the labours of her faithful minister.

II.—THE EFFECTS OF PREACHING.

If we take a view of the principal events which have occurred in the history of genuine religion, we shall find they have all been promoted by means of preaching.

1. The first fact to which we allude is the publication of Christianity. Our Saviour himself employed the greater part of his time in preaching; the apostles were all preachers, but few were authors. After the persecution at Jerusalem, they went into all countries, preaching the gospel of the kingdom. The state of the world, at this time, was exceedingly favourable to this means of publishing the truths of our holy religion.

After the Babylonish captivity, a revolution had taken place in the character of the Jewish nation. Their language had undergone a change, which rendered it necessary that the *words* of their law, as well as the law itself, should be explained. They had become a commercial people. They had intermingled with strangers, and enjoyed settlements in every considerable city in the Roman empire. Residing at a distance from Judæa, they found it impossible to visit the

temple at Jerusalem so frequently as the law required. Hence, synagogues were erected, in which the Jews assembled every Sabbath-day, for the purpose of religious instruction. In these assemblies the office of delivering public instruction does not appear to have been limited to the Levites, or to any particular class; and hence the apostles, even though strangers, were generally permitted, and sometimes invited, to address the people.

The state of the heathen world too, at the period of the introduction of Christianity, was favourable to preaching. The Roman people, by the constitution of their government, by their frequent assemblies to debate on the most important subjects, by the nature of their judicial administration, and by the harangues of their generals in the field, had become familiar with popular addresses. Eloquence was the direct path to all the honours of the state; and though the power of the government was transferred from the hands of the people to the hand of an individual, yet, at the period of the publication of Christianity, a sufficient number of the forms of the republic were preserved to maintain, in the minds of the people, an attachment to public speaking. In addition to these circumstances, the literature and philosophy of Greece—a philosophy which, however sceptical and erroneous, delighted in discussion and disputation—had become the favourite study of the Roman people, and tended to diminish those feelings of repugnance to which the human mind is subject on the first publication of novel and strange doctrines.

With these advantages, and under an Almighty agency, the first preachers of the gospel went forward to proclaim the glad tidings of salvation to a deluded and degraded world. The exertions of their zeal and benevolence produced astonishing effects. The light of truth dispersed the darkness which had involved the minds of the people; it laid open to public view the abominations which were practised in the temple of superstition, and some of its divine rays reached even the palace and the throne.

2. The second important event, in which we trace the agency of preaching, is the reformation from Popery. Pre-

vious to the time of Constantine, all Christians were dissenters from the established religion of the state. At his command, Christianity was introduced into the palace, and courtiers did her homage. But while the courtiers bent their knees in her presence, they did it with the object of courtiers in their view,—to employ her influence for the means of their own exaltation. Associated with the corruptions of a court, the Primitive Church soon lost the amiable simplicity of her manner and the inflexible integrity of her principles. The elevation to which she was raised bewildered her imagination —the blandishments with which she was adorned removed her modesty—the presents she received corrupted her virtue; till, eventually, she was denounced from heaven as the mother of harlots, the abomination of the whole earth. Through a long series of years, we shall look in vain among the pulpit ecclesiastics for any resemblance to the labour, the zeal, and the disinterestedness which characterized the apostolic days. But by a concatenation of circumstances, which clearly demonstrate the intervention of a superhuman power,* this unhappy state of the Christian world was considerably ameliorated, and that too in a great degree by means of preaching. As the sale of Indulgences (the circumstance which first roused the zeal of the Reformers) was promoted by means of hireling preachers, who highly extolled the virtues of these licences for sin, the opposers of this measure naturally recurred to the same means of exposing their futility and impiety; and hence, on both sides of the controversy, preaching was the first and most general means of carrying on the warfare. In proportion as the Reformation advanced, in such proportion did preaching extend. The authority of fathers and councils was disregarded—the right of private judgment, in matters of religion, was recognised—the Bible, it was contended, was the only standard of divine truth; and the interpretations of the sacred volume were required to be consonant to common sense; and for the truth of these important sentiments the Reformers appealed both

* See a Sermon, entitled, "The Reformation from Popery the Work of God," by the Rev. Thomas Gilbart.

from the pulpit and by the press to the general understanding of mankind. In the days previous to this important event, preaching had been in a great measure disregarded, and its place had been usurped by a long form of prayer written in an unknown tongue. In England, Bishop Latimer stated, that the pulpit of the Romish bishops had been like bells without clappers for many a long year. But immediately afterwards we find a host of able ministers, whose important and zealous labours, whose powerful and impressive eloquence confirmed and extended the important work which had been so happily commenced.

3. The third event is the revival of religion by the ministry of Whitfield and Wesley. Previous to the appearance of these two faithful servants of Christ, the Protestant church had sunk into a state of Laodicean indifference. From this alarming state—a state more pernicious to true piety than a state of contest with error, or even a state of persecution by the sword—the religious public were aroused by the appeals of Christian eloquence. After the example of their divine Master, these illustrious individuals went through the land, *preaching* the glad tidings of salvation. The effects were soon apparent: congregations were collected — places of worship were raised—the ministers of religion were multiplied—and the church of Christ received an abundant increase of glory, both in the number and in the character of her members. The effects of this revival were equally beneficial in regard to pulpit eloquence. The appeals of impassioned feeling, when associated with beauty of composition, force of reasoning, and eloquence of diction, and placed under the direction of Christian zeal, produced an influence too powerful to be counteracted by dull moral essays, feebly read. Hence, from the days of those holy men, and in consequence of their exertions, we have witnessed a progressive improvement in pulpit eloquence, as well as an increased attention to the interests of religion. The seed of life, planted by their labours, has become a great tree, and is still extending its branches in all directions, covered with blossoms, and loaded with fruit.

4. In our days we have witnessed the approach of another era in the Christian church. This may be called the era of benevolence. We find in this era the effects of pulpit eloquence are as beneficial as in any preceding period. Multitudes assemble together: by their united efforts, they endeavour to instruct the young, to enlighten the ignorant, to extend the Gospel, to alleviate the oppression of human woe. But who are the most active agents in this glorious work? Are they not the ministers of religion? Are *they* not the most eloquent and the most powerful advocates in all our public meetings? Is it not they who cause the hearts of assembled thousands to thrill with the soft emotions of philanthropic tenderness, or to glow with all the ardour of evangelic zeal? Nay, did not all our societies, which form the glory of our age, derive their origin from our places of religious worship? Can any society be named which is not, at least in some of its ramifications, connected with our churches and chapels? Or can we produce a single church or chapel which is not connected with several of these excellent institutions? Can we say anything more in commendation of pulpit eloquence than this? It is to this we owe the success which attended the first publication of Christianity. It is to this we owe the glorious Reformation. It is to this we owe the revival of religion in our own country. It is to this we owe those institutions which will immortalise the age in which we live. It is the ministers of the sanctuary who have lighted up the brilliancy with which we are encircled. Our places of religious worship are the central orbs of all our systems of benevolence, round which they make their constant revolution, and from whose genial fires they derive fresh influence, to urge them forward in their splendid career.

III.—APOSTOLICAL PREACHING.

THE institution of public preaching as a means of religious instruction appears to be almost peculiar to Christianity. Among the Jewish people, indeed, in particular periods of

their history, as in the days of Jehoshaphat, the priests were employed in instructing the nation; but among the heathen nations we find nothing which will bear a comparison with it. They had gorgeous robes and splendid temples, pompous ceremonies and costly sacrifices, but there were no institutions for the instruction of the people. The apostles of Christ were, if not the first, at least the most illustrious preachers who ever appeared among mankind. Though the state of the church is different from its state in their days, and though the art of printing, and the consequent facility of circulating information have altered the state of society, yet, as human nature is the same, as the truths of the Gospel are the same, and as the object of the Christian ministry is the same, the specimens of their public addresses which have been transmitted to us furnish proper models for our imitation. In the Book of Acts are recorded about sixteen sermons delivered by different apostles. A consideration of these sermons, and of the peculiar circumstances of the apostles, may suggest some useful observations.

1. The expressions employed to denote the act of preaching will serve to give a general idea of the strain of their discourse. Apollos mightily *convinced* the Jews; St. Paul, at Corinth, *reasoned* in the synagogue every Sabbath-day, and *persuaded* the Jews and the Greeks. At Thessalonica, he *reasoned* with them out of the Scriptures. Before Felix he *reasoned* of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come. At Ephesus he *disputed* and *persuaded.* To the Christian churches he gave much *exhortation.* To the Jews at Rome he *expounded* and *testified.* From these modes of expression we learn that the apostles addressed both the intellects and the feelings of their auditors. Those ministers who confine all religion to the right exercise of the judgment appear to forget that man is not purely an intellectual being, but is endowed with other powers, which have oftener a greater influence in the regulation of his conduct; while those, on the other hand, who, under the pleasing idea of avoiding disputation, confine all their addresses to the feelings, forget that the understanding is the most noble

faculty of man, and consequently the most acceptable offering to God. Nor do they seem to be aware that, by making religion to consist in feeling independent of judgment, they are maintaining a principle which has been the cause of all the absurdity and superstition with which Paganism and Popery have filled the world.

2. In noticing the subjects of their discourse, we observe they often referred to the prophecies. It was by comparing the predictions of the Old Testament with the facts and events of which they were themselves the witnesses that they proved the Messiah was actually come. They often referred to the historical facts of the Old Testament. To remind the Jews of the antiquity of their nation, and the greatness of their ancestors, was the usual practice of all the public speakers of that nation. The facts of the Old Testament became more important on the introduction of Christianity, as they serve to prove that the events of history, and the laws of Moses, had all been arranged in subserviency to the Christian system. But the apostles insisted especially on the resurrection of Christ. They proclaimed this as a proof of his divinity, as the fulfilment of prophecy, and as an evidence of the general resurrection of the dead.

3. We may observe that, in making quotations, they were not anxious about minuteness of reference. They often cite the words without mentioning the name of the author, as thus: "the promise which was made unto our fathers." They more frequently mention the name of the prophet, without stating in what part of his writings they were to be found. There is only one instance in which the reference was as precise as the then state of the sacred writings would admit. It is used by St. Paul at Antioch: "As it is written in the *second Psalm.*" The practice of giving chapter and verse for every text which may be introduced into sermons is now, in a great measure, discontinued. If, at the time, the preacher turns to the text, it causes a great interruption in the discourse; if he do not, it is merely an ostentatious display of the powers of memory. Besides, it is expected the people will turn to their Bibles to read the passage? If they do, must they not

lose a part of the sermon? and if they do not, where is the utility of giving chapter and verse? Except in proving particular points of doctrine, this practice is surely unnecessary, as all our congregations may be supposed to consist of persons who have a general acquaintance with the sacred writings.

4. We observe that the apostles often referred to their personal experience. Several times St. Paul relates the history of his own conversion. But does this countenance a minister in delivering from the pulpit an account of his own feelings, and the operation of his own mind? I think the two cases are entirely different. The apostles were witnesses of facts, of important facts, facts on which depended a considerable portion of the evidence of the truth of the doctrines they taught. Hence, they exclaimed, "We are witnesses of these. What we have seen and heard, and our hands have handled, of the word of life, that declare we unto you." The conversion of St. Paul was miraculous, and he relates it to account for the wonderful change that had taken place in his character, and as an evidence of his call to the work of an apostle. But will this justify a man standing in the pulpit, and pretending to explain the sacred volume, by giving us a long account of his hopes and his fears, his temptations and trials, his afflictions and consolations, and this, too, expressed in a strong metaphorical language, and before a promiscuous assembly? Is there not too much egotism in this? May it not expose not only himself, but religion also, to the ridicule of the unregenerate? And is there no danger that, in speaking of himself, he may be tempted to be a little hyperbolical? Besides, it is unnecessary. What state of mind can possibly exist which is incapable of being expressed and exemplified in the language of Scripture?

5. We may notice the appellations which they applied to their congregations. The apostles sometimes addressed their hearers by names taken from their nation or country—Men of Judæa, Men of Athens, Men of Israel. Sometimes by their office—Ye Rulers of the people, and Elders of Israel. At other times, Men, Brethren, and Fathers: simply Brethren,

but most commonly, Men and Brethren. This mode of address appears to have been limited to the Christian Church and to the Jewish people; for, in speaking to the heathenish multitude at Lystra, St. Paul styles them Sirs. In modern times we chiefly use the word Brethren. It has high authority, and has become venerable from age. It is far superior to Sirs. The only objection to which it is liable is, that it might by some persons be conjectured to apply to only half the congregation, and thus all the females may be supposed to be excluded from the preacher's address. The terms, My fellow-sinners, My fellow-mortals, My dear hearers, do not possess sufficient dignity for the pulpit. My *respected* friends, My beloved hearers, and similar expressions, denoting a spirit of adulation in the speaker, are equally objectionable.

6. We may observe, that the apostles adapted their discourses to the character of their audience. In speaking to the Jews, St. Paul referred them to the writings of the prophets who had spoken unto their fathers, and hence he proved that Jesus of Nazareth was the promised Messiah. But this mode of address was not adapted for the citizens of Athens. They did not possess the sacred oracles. They were unacquainted with them. Hence to them St. Paul preached natural religion; he appealed to the works of creation, the circumstances of nations, the writings of their poets, and concluded by announcing the revelation of the Gospel. Our religious assemblies do not differ so widely from each other, but each assembly presents the greatest possible variety of character. Unlike the public assemblies of Greece and Rome, a considerable part is composed of females and children: here are the affluent and the indigent, the learned and the illiterate; persons of both sexes, of all ages, of different occupations, of various social connections, and of every variety of circumstance. Each individual has prejudices and temptations and difficulties peculiar to himself. How difficult for a public teacher to render his instructions and admonitions suitable to them all! Yet, by an habitual cultivation of his talents, by constant observation of human nature and human manners, by a diligent study of the Holy

Scriptures, and by a close imitation of the conduct of the apostles, this difficulty may be overcome, and, like a wise steward, he will give unto every one his portion of meat in due season.

IV.—TEXTUAL PREACHING.

Fashion, who regulates at her caprice the departments of dress, furniture, and amusement, exercises an influence scarcely less despotic over the provinces of literature and religion. Pulpit eloquence is subject to her control, and has varied its complexion with the varying manners and taste of each succeeding age. In the present day its prevailing character appears to be declamation. The principal mode of discussion is the textual. A portion of Scripture, consisting generally of a single verse, is announced: this is divided into two, three, or four parts; these divisions are subdivided, and these subdivisions form the leading ideas of the discourse.

Whatever ingenuity may be displayed in the construction of a textual sermon, this mode of preaching, especially when constantly pursued, is liable to considerable objections.

First. Is there no danger that a minister may be induced to choose a text, not because of the richness of its sentiments, not because of its adaptation to the circumstances of his hearers, but because it consists of two or three distinct clauses, which can easily form the divisions of his sermon?

Secondly. Does not this mode destroy the unity of a sermon as a literary composition? Does not a text often embrace several subjects which have but a remote connection with each other? And hence, does not the sermon often include the discussion of a variety of subjects between which the only bond of union is the text? And when only one hour is allotted for the discussion of several subjects, must not some of them be discussed very imperfectly? Do we not often find that the text is completely tortured, that it is examined as to what it expresses and what it implies—what

it asserts and what it intimates—in order that the words may, by some means or other, be twisted into a regular plan?

Thirdly. Is it not to be feared that ingenuity of arrangement will be often substituted for importance of sentiment? It is necessary to the speaker that a discourse should have divisions, and it is necessary to the hearers that these divisions should be announced; but the divisions of a discourse form but a small part of the information it contains. The textual mode of preaching has a tendency to make us satisfied with these, instead of seeking to store our minds with useful knowledge. It is not from the enumeration but from the discussion of these divisions that our knowledge must be derived. What should we know of the nature of a plant by hearing the lecturer announce the order in which he intended to treat of its several parts? But a textual sermon has not even this advantage, for its parts are not divisions of a subject, but divisions of a sentence.

Fourthly. In a succession of textual sermons, will not a repetition of the same ideas, and often of the same phraseology, necessarily occur? Some ministers are so sensible of this that, in order to avoid it, they preach several sermons from the same text. This appears to display great fertility of invention, but in reality it does no such thing; it is merely a clumsy way of stringing together the discussion of several subjects, each of which might with greater propriety be discussed separately with its own particular text.

Most, if not all, of these objections would be removed, if our sermons were founded on *subjects* instead of *texts*. The discussion of the doctrine, duty, virtue, character, or fact previously selected, would then embrace the whole of the subject, and not merely a single property which might be incidentally mentioned in any particular text. There can be no difficulty in making the selection. So inexhaustible are the stores of the inspired volume, that sacred truth can be exhibited in a variety of forms, historical, biographical, expository, argumentative, or didactic.

It is much to be regretted that our ministers are not more

in the habit of preaching series of connected lectures. It is true we have many of these in print. But what is the reason that this mode of preaching is adopted only by those ministers who possess extraordinary abilities, and by them only when intended for publication? If this practice be so eminently beneficial as the publication of the sermons would lead us to suppose, why is it not more generally imitated? Will any one assert that, after all the learning of our colleges and academies, it is an exercise of which our preachers are incapable? Surely no one will affirm this. Will it be said that it requires a greater degree of study? It may easily be imagined that such an objection should be made by those who, having engaged in the ministry because it is a genteel profession, consider study as a drudgery, and wish to procure the money of their congregation for the least possible labour; but so far from being an objection, it would be an inducement with those who, animated by the spirit of their office, feel study to be a pleasure, and wish to feed their people with knowledge and understanding. This mode of preaching is attended with several advantages, both to the minister and the people.

1. It gives tone and direction to his studies. The mind never acts so powerfully as when ardently engaged in the pursuit of an individual object. Every literary man is conscious of the additional interest he feels when he reads, or thinks, for the purpose of illustrating some particular sentiment. He does not then saunter heedlessly along the path of literature, seeking only amusement and recreation, and ever liable to be drawn aside by every pleasing object that attracts his notice; but, like the traveller, he walks with eager and undeviating footsteps, nor relaxes his exertions till he arrives at his journey's end. In the one case, like the butterfly (the gaudy child of summer), he wanders from flower to flower, but makes no useful acquisitions; in the other, like the industrious bee, he extracts the sweets of the garden, and lays up for himself and others an invaluable treasure.

2. It saves the time which is employed in fixing on a text.

Ask a textual minister how much valuable time is thus irretrievably lost. Ask him how long he hesitates before his mind is fixed on a particular passage; whether he is not often compelled to relinquish the passage he has selected, because he cannot form it into regular divisions, or because some of its ramifications have too close a connection with a subject he has recently discussed; whether the preparation for the pulpit is not thus postponed day after day till the eve of the Sabbath, when, driven by necessity, he hastily makes choice of some hackneyed passage, to which he attaches a few commonplace ideas; and whether, on the following day, the dulness of his public exercises does not bear mournful testimony to the injurious tendency of this mode of preaching. By connected lectures these evils are avoided. The subject is already fixed—the plan of the building is already formed; and he has only to collect materials and to raise the structure.

3. It has a tendency to insure a full and constant attendance on the part of the congregation. Independent of the interest they excite by their superior merit, each individual entertains a fear of being absent on any occasion, lest he should lose the connection which subsists between the different subjects. He will not then be prevented from attending his own place of worship by apprehensions respecting the weather, or by the arrival of a popular preacher from the country; but he will be anxious to preserve that consistency and decorum in regard to the public services of the sanctuary which every sincere worshipper should endeavour to maintain.

4. But the most important result is, that it presents to the mind a systematic and comprehensive view of religious truth. A textual preacher discusses the body of divinity as an ignorant empiric might attempt to explain the human body. He expatiates only on those parts to which he may be directed by caprice; or if in the course of time he explained the whole, there is such a deficiency in the arrangement, that the mind of the auditor is bewildered rather than instructed. But in the other case the minister resembles the skilful anatomist, who lectures successively on the different parts of

the animal structure till he has presented a perfect development of the whole system. Or, to employ another illustration, these two characters sustain the same relation to each other as the tourist and the statesman, when describing a foreign country. The former notices those objects only to which his attention happened to be directed by the occurrence of accident or the dictates of fancy. The latter minutely describes the peculiarity and productions of the different provinces of the empire, notices the customs, the power, the government, and the religion of the country, and presents a full and comprehensive view of the subject he professes to teach.

V.—ON READING SERMONS.

A MINISTER may pursue four methods in regard to his public exercises. He may enter the pulpit without any previous preparation; he may arrange his ideas without studying the language; he may write out his sermons and commit them entirely to memory, or he may read his discourses from the pulpit. Although the phrase "extemporaneous effusions" has been applied by way of reproach to the discourses of all ministers who preach without a book, it may be questioned whether, even among the wildest enthusiasts, the public exercises of any preacher who has been exclusively devoted to the work of the ministry have been strictly of this character. The first method pointed out will, therefore, require no further consideration. Although the practice of repeating discourses *memoriter* is by no means so laborious as persons unaccustomed to the exercise would be ready to imagine; although it is sanctioned by the example of most, if not all, the French preachers, both Catholic and Protestant; and although it is far superior to the custom of reading sermons, yet it is liable to several objections. It is a heavy tax on the minister's time; he has the appearance of reciting a lesson, rather than of delivering an address; and as his attention is employed in endeavouring to recollect the

language, his feelings are less impressed with the importance of the subject. The two other methods remain to be compared—those of reading and preaching.

In behalf of reading sermons, it may be advanced, that a better exposition of religious truth may be expected when the sermon is altogether framed in the study than when it is composed in the pulpit; that greater accuracy and elegance of style will certainly be produced, and that the minister will not be subject to those embarrassments which may be occasioned by the sudden excitation of feeling, or a temporary lapse of memory. But it is replied, that in the other case the sermon *has been* composed in the study; that it is the language principally which is extemporaneous; that men of education feel no difficulty in clothing their ideas with correct and even elegant expressions, and that the example of extemporaneous speakers in the pulpit, the bar, and the senate, are sufficient to show that we have but little reason to dread a degree of embarrassment which may cause any serious interruption.

The practice of reading sermons, on the other hand, appears to be liable to the following objections:—

I. It is not adapted for the purposes of the Christian ministry. The design of the evangelical preacher is to instruct and to persuade. These objects are attained by means adapted to the feelings and principles of human nature. Man is not a mere reasoning machine, who receives truth and acts upon it as soon as it is propounded to his understanding. It is necessary not only to convince his judgment but to awaken his conscience, and to arouse his passions. But a discourse written out in the study is not adapted, either in composition or in style, to the production of these effects. The cool reflection of solitude is not a state of mind calculated to produce those energetic feelings, or that pathetic language, suited to warn the careless or to console the wretched. Though previous reflection may supply ideas, it is only engagement in these exercises which can produce a proper state of feeling, or inspire that diction which is best adapted for oral discussion. Even the warmth

of delivery will often excite appropriate ideas and strong modes of expression, which the same person would not be able to produce in retirement. But as great names have often more weight than strong arguments, I shall on this subject produce the authority of two authors, both of whom were eminent preachers.

Fenelon, describing an extemporaneous preacher, says, "Il se possède—il parle naturellement—il ne parle point en déclamateur. Les choses coulent de source—ses expressions sont vives et pleines de mouvement—la chaleur même qui l'anime lui fait trouver des expressions et des figures qu'il n'aurait pu préparer dans son étude."* "It is certainly a great disadvantage," says Dr. Blair, "that the practice of reading sermons has prevailed in England. This may, indeed, have introduced accuracy, but it has done great prejudice to eloquence; for a discourse read is far inferior to an oration spoken. It leads to a different sort of composition as well as of delivery, and can never have an equal effect on an audience. Hence, from the art of persuasion, which preaching ought always to be, it has passed in England into mere reasoning and instruction, which not only has brought down the eloquence of the pulpit to a lower tone than it might justly assume, but has produced this farther effect, that by accustoming the public ear to such cool and dispassionate discourses, it has tended to fashion other kinds of public speaking on the same model."†

II. It diminishes the usefulness of the minister.

A Christian minister is required to be instant in season and out of season. How unexpectedly are often his calls to duty — how frequently are occasions presented which require prompt reproof—how suddenly is he compelled to visit the afflicted, or offer up his devotions at the bedside of the dying! But his qualifications for these exercises will be diminished if unaccustomed to extemporaneous address. Feeling the loss of his book, he will perform these important duties in a manner less satisfactory to himself, and less

* Dialogues sur l'Eloquence, p. 70.

† Blair's Lectures, p. 342, 8vo.

adapted to promote the edification of his hearers. The peculiar features of the present times have opened to the Christian minister a new field of exertion. To mount the platform is now almost as necessary as to ascend the pulpit. And how often on those public occasions has a minister, who has been accustomed to read his sermons, been called upon to advocate the cause of some religious society! How often has he spoken in pain, and been heard with irksomeness, although endowed with exalted intellect, profound knowledge, and extensive learning, and at the very time delivering a speech which himself only could have composed; while another minister, far his inferior in years and in wisdom, has spoken with ease, and been heard with rapture, in consequence of having accustomed himself to extemporaneous address.

III. It is repugnant to the principles of oratory.

Rhetoricians make a distinction between oratory and eloquence; the latter refers merely to composition and style (hence we may say Buffon and Hume were eloquent writers), but oratory includes also propriety of delivery. Though eloquence does not include oratory, oratory always includes eloquence. If this distinction be admitted, it will follow, that those who read their sermons, however eloquent those sermons may be, can never be orators. Though modern preachers study eloquence, they seem, in a great measure, to neglect the study of the principle department of oratory. The ancients did not so neglect it. The story of Demosthenes is well known. When asked, What was the first requisite in a public speaker? he answered, Action. What was the second?—Action. The third?—Action. Thus Demosthenes, whose orations are distinguished by the closeness of their reasoning and the force of their expression, considered that their whole effect depended on action. The ancient orators considered they were more dependent for success on the manner in which their addresses were delivered than upon the ideas and reasonings they contained. Hence they studied human feeling; hence all their treatises on rhetoric included a description of human characters and of human passions,

and pointed out the most effectual means by which those passions might be excited or allayed. If Pagan orators studied human nature so assiduously, and were so anxious to seize every means of persuasion, should Christian teachers be less eager to discover the avenues to the heart, and to employ every means by which souls may be won? Does not the Divine Being work by means in the moral as well as in in the natural world, and will not those means be most effectual which are best adapted to the end to be obtained?

Oratorical delivery refers to the voice, the countenance, and the gesture.

In *reading*, the tones of the voice are altogether different from extemporaneous address. By no strength of imagination can we believe a reader to be a speaker. He always appears to our minds as an intermediate character, who is relating the words of another. He never appears so fully impressed with the importance of the subject, and hence he never fails to produce a less effect on the minds of those to whom his language is addressed. And where is the expression of the countenance? He utters, indeed, sentiments of zeal, of indignation, of piety, or of love. Does he exhibit any of these emotions? If you did not hear his voice, would you imagine that he was delivering such sentiments? The eyes, the windows of the soul, in which every feeling of the mind should be exhibited, are almost closed, and cast downwards on the book. His attention is divided, and the feeling with which he is most impressed is a desire to read correctly, to avoid missing the line, and to take care that no ill-written word shall offer any interruption to his progress. With regard to gesture, he resembles a speaking statue. This is his most favourable position: if he attempt to move, he will necessarily appear ridiculous. As the magnetic needle points toward the north, in whatever position the ship may be placed, so, whatever attitude he may assume, to whatever part of the audience his face may be directed, whether his arms be raised or depressed, still his eyes must have one direction, they must be riveted on the book. Some ministers, it is true, occasionally raise their eyes while pronounc-

ing the latter part of a sentence. In this case the reader is in a position similar to that described in the following anecdote:—An honest countryman, after having been at church, where he had heard a sermon *read*, was asked by his wife, when he went home, how he liked the preacher. "Alas! woman," said he, "he was as poor a preacher as ever I saw; he was just like a crow picking the corn, for he always put down his head for a pick, and then looked about to see if any person was coming near him."

Thus religion is deprived of those powerful attractions that oratory confers, and fashion has bound up in chains of ice the warmth and the eloquence of our country.

IV. It is unauthorized by example, either sacred or profane.

The public speeches of Moses, Joshua, Samuel, and others, some of which are of considerable length, were all delivered extemporaneously. When Ezra, from morning until the mid-day, read in the streets of Jerusalem the book of the law of God, and gave the sense, and caused the people to understand the meaning, is there any mention of a little black-covered book that contained his comments? All the public addresses of the prophets are recorded in a manner that shows they were not written till after they were delivered. With regard to the apostles, it is evident in most cases, from the occasions on which their sermons were preached, that they were not previously written, and certainly were never publicly read. But it may be said, all these were inspired men. Assuredly they were, and hence this mode of address has the sanction of Divine authority. The Holy Spirit would doubtless employ the best means of accomplishing his designs; and as preaching was employed in preference to reading, it proves that this means was the most effectual.

Neither the Greek nor Roman orators read their speeches. They often spoke strictly extemporaneously, and Demosthenes was taunted by his contemporaries for his inability to speak without previous study. That great orator, according to Plutarch, "neither wrote the whole of his orations nor spoke without first committing part to writing." This is precisely

the practice adopted by our own preachers. The speakers at the bar and the senate never use a book. In the House of Commons a member is not even permitted to read a speech; and what reason can be assigned that this prohibition should not be extended to the pulpit?

V. It is injurious to the interests of religion.

The custom of reading sermons was one of the first indications of the decline of primitive Christianity. It was not introduced till her purity had been sullied by a union with political power, and the ministers of religion had become more anxious to obtain secular honours than properly to discharge their sacred functions. And could we ascertain the precise extent to which it has been carried at different ages of the Church, we should probably have a good criterion by which we might judge of the state of genuine piety at these respective periods. Independent of the pernicious influence which it immediately exerts, it has given rise to customs by which its injurious effects have been increased. It has introduced the reading of prayers. Even the devotional exercises before and after sermon are usually read, and constantly repeated, by those ministers who read their discourses. And thus those prayers, the words of which it would appear were designedly left to the discretion of the minister, in order that they might be adapted to the subject of discussion, become as much a matter of form as the Liturgy itself. It has given rise to the preaching of sermons composed by others, a practice so prevalent, that not only are printed discourses again delivered from the pulpit, but manuscript sermons are advertised in our public journals—a practice so injurious that, by enabling men without talents and without piety to occupy the sacred office, it aims a deadly blow at the vitals of religion. The reading of sermons has introduced formality into our public services, dulness in the minister, listlessness in the hearers, and every disposition unfriendly to piety. To this cause, too, must be ascribed the dearth of hearers in many of our churches, and the paucity of eminent preachers in the pulpits of Great Britain. And hence it is that so many, disgusted with the lukewarm addresses of a reading lecturer,

rush into the opposite extreme, and listen with eagerness to the less polished but more fervent appeals of enthusiastical teachers.

It has been said that extemporaneous preaching requires extraordinary talents, and that the opposite course is sanctioned by the practice of many eminent ministers. But daily experience shows that it does not require powers unattainable by ordinary minds. And we know that eminent men are liable to be biassed by fashion, by their modes of study, or by the influence of habit, as well as ordinary individuals. And, while we would not treat imbecility with harshness, nor expect that confirmed habits will be abandoned, still we must contend, that the minister who unwarrantably adopts the practice of reading his sermons may justly be charged with neglecting to employ one of the most powerful moral means that Heaven has appointed for the restoration of man.

VI.—THE PULPIT, THE BAR, AND THE SENATE.

THOUGH the art of printing has been productive of incalculable advantage to the cause of literature, it has, in some respects at least, been injurious to the interests of eloquence. In modern times the invaluable teachers under whose guidance we range through all the departments of science, wander over the field of history, or mount on the wings of poesy, are constant residents in our own habitation. It was not so in ancient days. In those periods, when all the knowledge of the age was confined to manuscripts, inaccessible to general use, the literary student attached himself to some celebrated master, attended his lectures, and, from his *oral* instructions, derived his acquaintance with that particular branch of study which was the object of his pursuit. Hence the teacher of every science was also an orator, and eloquence was associated with every department of knowledge. The absence of a public means of correspondence produced a more frequent intercourse between the learned. By friendly debate in the porticoes of Athens, they solved each other's doubts, and im-

proved each other's knowledge; while the statues of their predecessors, placed around them, invigorated their genius and awakened their emulation. In a distant grove, beneath a sky as serene and pure as ever soothed the passions or nurtured thought, while the lofty trees cast their shade over his head, and the winds of heaven wafted around him the odour of ten thousand flowers, the philosopher, standing on an eminence in all the dignity of conscious greatness, poured forth with the living voice into the ears of his disciples, who were seated around him, those lessons of instruction which his own study and his own experience had supplied; while, on the adjacent plain, those who had by genius or travel compiled works worthy of immortality, publicly recited their compositions to the multitudes assembled at the Olympic games, and received the garland of honour which their grateful and enlightened auditors placed around their brows.

The only public discourses which we have in our days, in connection with *science*, are the lectures delivered at our philosophical institutions. But as these lectures are confined chiefly to those subjects that require to be illustrated by experiments, they afford but little opportunity for the introduction of eloquence.

Military eloquence, for which the ancients were so remarkable, and which on particular occasions produced such surprising effects, has, in consequence of the alteration in the manners of society, and the difference in the mode of warfare, been altogether discontinued.

The eloquence of the *Bar* has become also restricted. The following advice given to pleaders by Aristotle is inapplicable to modern times:*—"If it happen that a certain law makes in *favour of an* advocate, then he must contend for the advantage of written laws, and argue in their favour, that a legislator will in vain establish laws if they are not to be strictly observed; for to make laws and not to observe them, is the same thing as if they were never made. But when the advocate shall perceive any written law to make *against* his cause, he must have recourse to common law and

* *Vide* Aristotle's Rhetoric, translated by Crimmin, page 162.

equity, and maintain that the latter are more incomparably certain than the others, and more friendly to justice; for these are permanent and unchangeable, and conformable to nature, whereas written laws are variable, and of short duration." No pleader would now be permitted to argue against the authority of the written law. Hence appeals to natural equity, so friendly to the orator, are excluded from our courts: and this kind of eloquence is still farther limited by the comparatively small number of our judges, and the multiplicity of our statutes.

With regard to the eloquence of the *Senate*, as these assemblies among the ancient republics possessed the executive as well as the legislative functions, they appear to have presented a wider and more interesting field of discussion. But, on the other hand, the science of political economy is considerably enlarged, the page of history is more ample, and the orator, from the events and institutions of other nations, or of particular periods, can more easily gather arguments to prove the propriety or impropriety of the measure proposed. It must be recollected, too, that the most important acts of the executive power are subsequently brought under the notice of parliament.

Pulpit eloquence was unknown to the ancients: it is almost peculiar to Christianity; and in no age has it reached a higher degree of eminence than in the present times.

The Pulpit, the Bar, and the Senate are the principal seats of modern eloquence. We shall make a comparison between them, with a view to ascertain which presents the most favourable occasion for the display of oratory. For the sake of method, our remarks will be arranged in reference to the subject, the speaker, and the audience, and we shall endeavour to show that in every respect the Preacher has the advantage.

I.—In regard to the *subjects* which are discussed.

1. The subjects discussed in the Pulpit are confessedly the most important.

They do not refer merely to outward prosperity, but they are connected with the soul. It is not only an individual

citizen or a single nation that is concerned, but they interest the whole human race. It is not a temporary interest that is at stake, but they embrace the concerns of eternity. It is not the will of a monarch, or the laws of a community, that is the subject of consideration, but the commands of God, the Creator of the universe.

2. In the Pulpit the range of discussion is more extensive.

The Pleader is confined to law, and the Senator to politics. Here the Preacher has a considerable advantage. The science of Theology, as revealed in the Holy Scriptures, is in itself an extensive field of discussion, and she places under tribute all the other branches of knowledge. Human nature becomes naturally the subject of investigation. Ethics, deducing her laws from reason and experience, exhibits their conformity with the dictates of revelation. From history the Preacher derives information respecting the authenticity of the Scriptures, the fulfilment of prophecy, and the wonders of Providence. Natural philosophy opens her stores, and exhibits the wonderful attributes of the Creator in the constitution of the world. Even grammar and philology are often introduced to fix the meaning of disputed texts, and to prevent the holy word from being wrested to the support of erroneous sentiments. There is, in short, no branch of science from which the Preacher may not gather materials for illustrating or enforcing the truths of religion.

3. The subjects discussed in the Pulpit are those in which the hearers have the deepest interest.

At the Bar, that part of the audience which is immediately interested is exceedingly few. The greater number are spectators, who listen only to gratify their curiosity, or to please their taste. In the Senate, though the subject discussed interests a great number of persons, yet it is only a general interest which affects them in their collective capacity, and it makes but a slight impression on any one person. But the subjects of the Pulpit are closely united with the feelings of every auditor—each feels a personal interest—an interest not capable of being transferred—an interest peculiarly his own —one which affects him in his most important relations, and

is intimately associated with both his present and his eternal happiness.

4. The subjects discussed in the Pulpit admit of being enforced by appealing to the passions.

Passion is the soul of eloquence, but it can be admitted in only a limited degree at the Bar and in the Senate. The Pleader would render himself ridiculous, or be suspected of a wish to defeat the ends of justice, were he to address the feelings only of the jury. And though this kind of address may be employed to a greater extent in the Senate, yet even there it can be introduced only on particular occasions. And a crafty opponent will always represent the warmth of the disputant as a substitute for the deficiency of argument. But in the Pulpit energetic appeals to the passions of the audience form a legitimate and effectual means of persuasion. The subjects are adapted to rouse into action all the powers of the mind. Their importance warrants the strongest appeals to the heart. The Holy Scriptures present the sublimest models, and the prophets and apostles supply the most brilliant examples. With what zeal did those holy men exhaust all the power of language and all the force of metaphor, in order to break the fetters of indifference, and to cause anger and gratitude, hope and fear, joy and contrition, to exercise their alternate and beneficial influence on the mind!

II.—Compare the Pulpit, the Bar, and the Senate, in reference to the speaker.

1. In the Pulpit the speaker appears in a more dignified character.

He is a messenger from heaven. The doctrines he delivers have been revealed from above. The precepts he inculcates are the mandates of the Eternal. We listen with greater attention to the language of a man of superior rank, particularly when he appears as an ambassador from a powerful monarch, and more especially if the immediate object of his mission has a close connection with our national or personal interests. What an advantage, then, over all other speakers is possessed by the Preacher, who appears before his audience

as an ambassador of Christ; as belonging to an order of men appointed by the Deity himself to explain his will, and who claims attention in the name of the Lord.

2. In the Pulpit the speaker can choose the subject of discussion.

This is not the case with either the Barrister or the Senator. One is guided by his brief, the other is limited by the question. Nothing is more frequent than to hear Pleaders complain of the difficulties they experience from their imperfect knowledge of the cause they advocate. This often occurs in questions connected with maritime affairs and with the mechanical arts. Men who have passed their days in legal or political studies have but an imperfect knowledge of other sciences, or of other modes of life, and necessarily feel a difficulty when their profession compels them to discuss questions connected with pursuits so different from their own. From this difficulty the Preacher is entirely free. His subject is not fixed for him; but he can select for discussion those topics which are most congenial with his own talents and inclination.

3. The Preacher has the advantage of previous preparation.

In some cases the Senator and the Barrister have this advantage. But this is chiefly when the Senator has to *propose* any resolution, or when the Barrister is counsel for the *plaintiff* in a civil, or for the prosecution in a criminal cause. In other cases they are often called upon to speak extemporaneously, to reply to argument which they never before heard, and against which they could not have been provided. The Preacher, however, can arrange any part or the whole of his address; and he would not sin against modern practice were he even to write out his discourse, and read it from the Pulpit. But though an opportunity for previous meditation is an advantage to the Preacher, the practice of reading his sermons is so far from being such, that with respect to oratory, that custom alone is a sufficient counterbalance to all the advantages which he may possess.

4. The Preacher has no opponent.

In the other cases the orator may have produced a powerful impression on his audience, and immediately a speaker on the opposite side may rise and destroy the impression he has produced: and this is not the case merely when the speech itself is defective, for often the soundest argument is attacked with equal effect by the weapons of wit and irony; and the speaker has the mortification to see the impression which his laboured eloquence had produced gradually subside before the influence of ridicule. In the pulpit the Preacher stands without a rival. His words sink into the mind, and there rest, like nails fastened in a sure place by the master of assemblies.

5. With the Preacher the frequency of his public exercises must tend to the improvement of his talents.

The Barrister can speak only when the courts are held—the Senator only during the session of Parliament; and during these seasons, one individual claims but a comparatively small share of attention. The Preacher has his stated times of speaking all through the year. There are no seasons in which he is prohibited, and he cannot be preceded by another, who will preoccupy the attention, or anticipate his arguments. Nothing tends so much to improvement in public speaking as speaking frequently. It may require more previous study to collect ideas, but it necessarily tends to increase the power of the orator.

III.—Compare the Pulpit, the Bar, and the Senate, in regard to the audience.

1. The assemblies addressed by the Preacher include a greater variety of character.

In the other cases the audience is composed of individuals who, in regard to rank, education, and talents, may be supposed to be nearly on an equality. It is certain there is a less variety than is to be found in our religious assemblies.—Here we have persons of both sexes, of all ages, of different pursuits, and of various moral characters. This appears to increase the difficulties of the Preacher. It is almost impossible for him to deliver a discourse adapted to the condition of every individual. But while this circumstance renders

perfect success very difficult to be attained, it in the same degree prevents the possibility of a total failure; for it is almost impossible to deliver a discourse which shall not be adapted to some of these characters. A Barrister must convince the whole of the jury, and a Senator the majority of the Parliament, to obtain the object they have in view; but the success of a Preacher admits of an infinite number of degrees. And hence, while he has the consolation to reflect that he has not laboured in vain, he has, at the same time, the strongest inducements to "stir up the gift that is in him," that by an abundant success he may increase the splendour of "his glory and crown."

2. The audience of the Preacher is the most numerous.

In the other cases the assemblies do not generally comprise more than five or six hundred persons. We have churches and chapels capable of seating several thousands, and these, too, crowded to excess every Lord's day. It may be said, we have also many smaller places of worship, and, therefore, this is not a fair point of comparison; but it is fair to compare the most eminent of these speakers, and it is certain that the most eminent Senators and Barristers have not so large an assembly to address as the most eminent Preachers. This circumstance produces a great influence on the speaker; the very aspect of a large assembly, attentive to the voice of one man, has a tendency to give him an elevation of mind that will prompt the most vigorous conceptions and inspire the happiest results.

3. The audience entertain no doubts of the speaker's sincerity.

A persuasion that an orator is himself really convinced of the sentiments he utters has a great influence in producing a similar conviction in the minds of his hearers. We hesitate to admit the force of arguments which the proposer himself believes to be inconclusive. Here the Pleader is at a considerable disadvantage. It is well known that he speaks for hire; and had the opposite side applied first for his assistance, he would, with equal ability and with equal warmth, have assailed the party whom he now defends. And though the

disadvantage of the Senator is not so great, yet, as party spirit has a great influence in the formation of opinions, and as the Senate is divided into parties, with both of which it appears to be a maxim, that individual sentiments should be surrendered to those general principles which the parties may embrace, we do not listen to the address of a speaker who openly acts in connection with a party with that confidence we should place in a speaker who, we are convinced, follows the dictates of his individual judgment. The Preacher is beyond these suspicions. He has voluntarily embraced the doctrines he inculcates. The fervour of his address arises from his conviction of their importance, and his whole life is a practical exhibition of their influence.

4. The audience have no previous intimation of the subject to be discussed.

In the other cases the audience are acquainted with the subjects, and are often especially summoned for the occasion. But a religious assembly is totally unacquainted with the topic of discourse till the Preacher has announced his text. Hence the attention of the audience is maintained, and the interest is not exhausted by previous anticipation.

5. The audience assembles under circumstances of peculiar solemnity.

It is the Sabbath-day. Labour is called from the field; Trade has shut up her windows, and Pleasure has closed her gates.

The man arises in the morning with his mind serene, free from the vexatious anticipations of business, and awed by the sanctity of the day. He arrays himself in those habiliments which he assumes when about to visit a superior. Accompanied by his wife and children, the objects of his tenderest affection, he travels the accustomed road to that venerable sanctuary, endeared to him by habit, and by many a pleasing recollection. He takes his seat beneath the sacred roof. Music has soothed his passions, devotion has calmed his mind, and now, in solemn silence, he listens to the messenger from heaven, proclaiming truths on which is suspended his eternal welfare. With such an audience how immense is the

power of the orator! the minds of his hearers are as softened wax, and he has only to affix the seal of heaven.

History bears witness to the mighty power of Pulpit eloquence. It is to this we owe our emancipation from the fetters of superstition; it is to this we owe the increasing honours of the Christian church; it is to this religious benevolence is indebted for her most costly offerings.

Eloquence is well employed on other subjects. Whether at the bar of Justice she calls for vengeance on the guilty, or defends suspected innocence, she does well. Whether in the Senate she upholds the dignity of monarchs, or contends for the liberty of nations, she does well. But it is when she rises as the champion of religion that she appears in her greatest honours. Here, clothed in the sable garb of wisdom, in an attitude of commanding dignity, and with a voice of celestial mildness, she proclaims the will of God to man. The weapons of hostility drop from the hands of Infidelity; tears steal down the cheeks of Contrition; Wretchedness rejoices in the hope of immortality; even the Dying are consoled by the recollection of her labours, and the immortal Spirit wings its way to the mansions of the blessed, and, amid the songs of angels, proclaims the triumphs of Pulpit Eloquence.

VII.—FEMALE PREACHERS.

A woman's preaching is like a dog's walking on his hinder legs: it is not done well, but you are surprised to find it done at all.—*Boswell's Life of Johnson.*

As all our ideas are derived from sensation and reflection, it is impossible for man to form any notion which is not supplied either by the internal operations of his own mind, or the external circumstances by which he is surrounded. The heathens, therefore, in framing their systems of Paganism, not having any assistance from Divine revelation, necessarily made heaven to resemble the earth, and hence they had *female* as well as *male* divinities. It was natural to suppose that female deities would have a more particular regard for

the female part of mankind; while, on the other hand, the female part of mankind, oppressed as they were in all heathen countries by the tyranny of man, would prefer placing themselves under the protection of deities of their own sex. The female devotee would feel her vanity gratified, and her confidence increased, when, with bended knees, she approached a goddess, placed in circumstances similar to her own, and with whom she might indulge an unrestrained communion. Improvement in civilization, so far from leading the mind to the true God, multiplied the number of imaginary deities; while, at the same time, it not only gave women greater leisure for devotion, but also increased the circumstances in which they seem to require supernatural aid. Hence there were not only female deities who were supposed to watch over the general interests of women, but in every period of life, and in every variety of condition, there was a particular divinity, whose assistance the female worshipper was taught to invoke. It was going only one step farther to allow women to officiate in the public services of the temple. The women of Judah, in defiance of the threatenings of the prophet Jeremiah, burnt incense and poured out drink-offerings unto the Queen of Heaven—a title of honour they conferred on the Moon; and in other lands the feasts of the female deities were celebrated by the women with the greatest pomp and the most unbounded licentiousness.

A lovely woman, in the bloom of youth, possessing the charms of beauty, arrayed in all the elegance of dress, and surrounded with the splendour of religion, forms in herself so interesting an object, and has so powerful an influence on the feelings of mankind, that the adherents of every system of mythology would endeavour to promote its interest by employing so irresistible an advocate. At the same time it was necessary to limit the number of these priestesses, lest their sanctity should be impeached, or their influence should be diminished, by a too general extension of the privilege. Hence, at Rome, a few young virgins were selected, who were endowed with the most extensive civil privileges, and

whose duty it was to keep alive the fires that burnt on the altar of the goddess Vesta.

In carrying on the system of imposture to which the ancient oracles were subservient, women were the most useful instruments. Vividness of imagination and violence of passion were necessary to produce those outrageous gesticulations which were represented to the common people as the effects of Divine inspiration. The Sibylline predictions and the oracular responses of Apollo, the god of Wisdom, were delivered to mankind by means of female agency.

Among other pagan corruptions introduced into the Christian church, some of the early sects* adopted the practice of having female preachers; but it was Popery that carried this principle to a greater extent, and applied it to a more absurd use when they excluded women from the ministerial office, in which, though they would do much evil, they might do some good, and shut them up by thousands in large buildings devoted to religious purposes, where they were taught they should best please the Author of their existence by withdrawing from society and taking the monastic vows.

In modern times, the greater number of speakers among the respectable Society of Friends are women. The new sects who have assumed the names of Revivalists, and of Arminian Bible Christians, have also their female preachers. A sermon was recently preached by one of these ladies in Islington Fields.

"But why not," the advocates of female preaching will exclaim,—"why should not women be allowed to preach as well as men? Are they deficient in intellectual vigour? Is their zeal or their piety less conspicuous? Is not their introduction to the ministry warranted by the declarations and examples of Scripture? And do not all civilized nations admit them to offices of equal importance?"

We will examine these interrogatories.

1. Why not?—Can they be charged *with any intellectual deficiency?* Do they not possess every degree of mental

* Buck's Theological Dictionary—article, Quintilians.

vigour? Are their faculties of acquiring or of communicating knowledge inferior to those of men? Have we not many female authors whose literary productions are equal to any that have been produced by the other sex?

Without being so unpolite as to maintain that the mind of man is superior to that of woman when viewed in reference to the whole of its powers, we must still contend, that in regard to the *intellectual faculty*, there is a difference which renders a female less qualified to fill the office of a preacher. Although a female writer* has denounced the phrase, "a masculine understanding," as "an arrogant assumption of reason," we think it may still be employed as denoting a distinction. There is a difference between the *persons* of the sexes: women are more fair, more slender, more graceful than men; but shorter and more feeble; less capable of bearing labour, or enduring fatigue—

> "For contemplation He, and valour form'd;
> For softness She, and sweet attractive grace."
>
> *Milton.*

Were we, therefore, to argue by analogy, we might infer there is a corresponding difference in their respective *minds.* Many feelings of the mind obviously operate in very different degrees in the male and female character. Women are *more* subject to fear, to pity, to affection; the intellectual faculties *may*, therefore, exist in similar disproportions. All civilized nations agree in assigning to females similar occupations. From this circumstance we may infer, that there exist inherently in all female minds dispositions corresponding to these respective employments. And, lastly, is it not necessary that man should have some peculiar intellectual excellence in order to make up for his other deficiencies, and place him on an equality with his more lovely companion?

The constitution of the female mind is *unfit for close application to study.* The office of a minister requires constant exercise of the intellectual faculty. Languages are to be acquired; sciences are to be studied; habits of reasoning, force of expression, and fluency of speech are to be attained:

* Mrs. Woolstonecroft's Vindication of the Rights of Women.

to accomplish these he must retire into solitude; must read, must study, must think, and employ every means which can be supplied by either his own genius or the assistance of others. After having made the necessary attainments, he has thence to commence a course of labour which requires constant and unremitting attention. In addition to the exertions connected with his public exercises, he has now to visit the sick, to instruct the young, to guide the wandering, and refute the unbelieving. For such activity, such close habits of study, such continued exertion, the female mind is not qualified.

The female constitution is not sufficiently robust to bear the fatigues of intense habits of thinking. In what way the exertion of the mind can operate to produce an unhealthy state of body is a secret which human investigation has not yet discovered; but numerous are the instances of young men who have fallen a sacrifice to an excessive attachment to literary pursuits. Bloom and vigour have insensibly faded; and the wreath of literary fame, which a grateful country has placed on their dying heads, has served only as a garland to decorate the victim. How, then, can a delicate female withstand an enemy by whom so many strong men have been overthrown? Women, it is true, can bear confinement and sedentary occupation better than men. But these are not the cause of the evil. It is the mental exertion which occasions this decay of health; and in proportion as the structure of the corporeal frame is more delicate, the consequences must be the more fatal.

A successful application to literary pursuits deprives woman of her principal attractions. It is a mournful fact, that literary men are very poor companions. How silent, how thoughtful they are! how unsociable are their manners! The solitude to which they are doomed, the close habits of thinking in which they are engaged, seldom fail to produce a stiffness of behaviour which may procure respect, but can never conciliate affection. The consciousness of their own attainments inclines them to look with contempt on other men. The high importance they attach to literature induces

them to undervalue the affairs of ordinary life. Hence they feel little interest in society, and contribute but little to its pleasures. It is a singular circumstance, and one which strikingly points out the anti-social influence of studious occupations, that most of our eminent writers have died bachelors. So strong was their attachment to literary pursuits, that it seems to have absorbed every other passion. It is natural to suppose that the operation of the same causes on a female mind would produce similar effects. And if so, how deplorable would be the change. That woman, who seems made for society; whose grateful office it is to dissipate the sternness of feeling which anxious thought produces on the mind of man; whose smiles smooth the brow of care, and light up with gaiety the countenance of labour;—that woman should lose her fine sensibilities, her innocent gaiety, her amiable manners, and should herself become subject to all those unhappy failings to which the student is exposed; should herself become a silent, sullen, haughty, unsociable being, fit for the torment rather than for the consolation of man! It is true, all literary men do not experience these effects to the extent which is here described, but they are evils to which all are exposed, and in which, to a certain degree, perhaps all participate. In their smallest degree they are opposed to the chief attractions of the softer sex. In proportion as a female approaches the character of a literary man, in such proportion does she recede from that of an amiable woman.

Those strong *emotions* by which females are distinguished render it improper that they should engage in public address. Men *think* intensely, and women *feel* intensely. There is no subject which calls the passions into operation so powerfully as religion; and women, whose passions are so ardent and imagination so vivid, would be exceedingly liable to mistake the suggestions of their own minds for the intimations of the Spirit, and would hence be led into irregularities inconsistent with the dignity of a public instructor. The wildest systems of enthusiasm have been supported chiefly by women. The tenets of some orthodox denominations,

who have been distinguished by the ardour of their zeal, have also, in obscure parts of the country, been occasionally advocated by women. But as these religious bodies have become more enlightened, female preaching has gradually declined. The Society of Friends will be pleaded as an exception. The violent frenzy which distinguished the original members of this sect has gradually subsided into the sober gravity of meditation, and yet female preachers are retained. With every feeling of respect for the morality and the benevolence of this society, it may be questioned whether the spirit of religion has not decayed. It is difficult to conceive how a society, without any public devotion, at whose religious meetings the Holy Scriptures are neither read nor explained, and who have renounced the observance of the sacraments, and the religious sentiments of whose members are either merged in uncertainty, or altogether unknown; it is difficult to conceive how such a society is able to cherish the feelings of evangelical religion. Judging by the laws of association, it is more natural to suppose that, among persons who are devoted to the active pursuits of life, the ruminations of the Sunday are connected with the affairs of the week, than it is to believe that the human mind, without any circumstance to give it an impulse, should instinctively follow the tract of devout meditation. The silence of their meetings is sometimes interrupted for a few minutes by the pious effusions of a female speaker; but from what we have heard, when occasionally attending their assemblies, we should infer that this circumstance does not possess any advantage calculated to call forth either the envy or the imitation of those who follow other modes of worship.

It is true, some females have distinguished themselves in the literary world. But their principal productions have been novels and poetry,—productions which require exuberance of feeling, and minuteness of observation, rather than any exercise of the intellectual faculties. No system of logic or of metaphysics, no code of laws, no treatise on algebra, has ever yet been written by a woman. But granting there

were some individuals who had distinguished themselves in the higher branches of learning, no general conclusion could be formed from these few instances. Some females have been remarkable for their military prowess—Does it follow that females ought to be admitted into the army? It is the same with preaching. A woman shouldering a musket does not present a more unsightly spectacle than a woman in the pulpit.

II. Why not?—Are not women possessed of *all the necessary moral and religious qualifications?* Are not their zeal and their piety equal to that of the men? Could they not explain much better the duties of a wife or a mother, of a daughter or a sister? and would they not on these topics be listened to with much greater attention, and produce a more happy effect?

In all ages women have been more devout than men. Their natural timidity, the sufferings to which they are exposed, and the fondness with which their affections linger on the memory of a beloved object whom they have consigned to the tomb—all tend to impress the mind with feelings of religion. Honourable mention is made of their piety in holy writ, and in times of persecution they have suffered heroically at the stake.

We have perhaps too much limited their exertions in the present age of the Christian world. We do not allow them to vote in our churches; they have no voice in the choice of a minister; they can fill no office in any Christian assembly; and though we permit them to form a part of our charitable societies, it appears to be done only with a view of employing their influence for the purpose of increasing the contributions. Even our domestic devotions are rarely conducted by the female head of the family. Is not this going too far? If females are excluded from offices in the church, what is the reason that they should not be allowed to vote for a pastor whose ministrations they are constantly to attend? Why should not our female Sunday-schools, and several of our institutions for the relief of the poor, be placed *entirely* under female superintendence? What objections can be advanced

against prayer-meetings in which females only should engage, and to which females only should be admitted? And why is it that the female head of the family is never allowed to conduct the domestic devotions? Would it not tend to stir up the sense of religion in their own minds, and would it not have a beneficial influence on the subordinate branches of the family?

But on no occasion should females be admitted into the pulpit, or be allowed to exercise the office of a pastor. They could not properly conduct the examinations to which candidates for admission into our churches are subjected. Their charity would prevent their being sufficiently scrutinous. Their amiable credulity, arising from their seclusion from society and their unacquaintance with the manners of the world, would often render them the dupes of deception. The warmth of their affections might induce them to form imprudent partialities. Attachments, arising in the first instance from motives purely spiritual, are sometimes apt to degenerate into feelings of a nature less exalted. Numerous are the instances of wealthy females becoming the wives of those ministers under whom they first received their religious impressions.

Women are fond of praise. Although this is a very innocent, and often a very useful passion, it is liable, when not under proper control, to produce unhappy effects. The applauses which are so lavishly bestowed on some of our popular ministers would, it is feared, produce unhappy effects if bestowed on a female preacher. Perhaps, too, the feelings of the panegyrist might give a complexion to his compliments calculated to render their influence still more pernicious.

Modesty is the glory of woman. To stand up before a multitude of people and reprove them for their faults—to meet a thousand eyes with indifference—requires a hardness of countenance scarcely consistent with that amiable bashfulness which casts a splendour round the female character, and not only heightens every other grace, but possesses a charm peculiarly its own.

Women are prone to superstition. The natural vehemence

of their passions prompts them to engage with ardour in the cause they espouse, while the influence of visible objects induces them to attach too much importance to the externals of religious worship. They are too much disposed to indulge a persuasion of the interference of supernatural agency. The belief in apparitions, witchcraft, and fortune-telling is now confined almost exclusively to the female sex. Religion is a reasonable service, and the introduction of superstition into the minds of its disciples has tended, more than any other circumstance, to corrupt its purity and to arm its opponents.

It may be true that there are several duties with which women have a more practical acquaintance than men. If this would justify their admission into the pulpit, we must, on the same ground, admit men of all occupations and all stations. In proportion as we are well acquainted with the duties and temptations of any particular class in society, in such proportion must we be ignorant of the peculiar circumstances of other classes. In the pulpit it is neither necessary nor decorous to state the minute circumstances of domestic life. Nor is it quite certain that those women who should devote themselves to reading, study, and preaching, would be very remarkable for their acquaintance with domestic affairs.

III. Why not? Is not *Scripture authority* in its favour? Is it not said that male and female are one in Christ Jesus? Do we not read of *prophetesses* in the Old Testament? Is it not declared, in the prophecy of Joel, "I will pour out my Spirit, and your sons and *your daughters* shall prophesy?" and is not this prediction applied by St. Peter to the Christian dispensation? Are we not told that Philip had four daughters who prophesied? Did not Priscilla, as well as Aquila, instruct Apollos? And was not Paul accompanied by several women who laboured with him in the Gospel?

Scriptural authority is decidedly against female preachers. St. Paul expressly prohibits women preaching in the church: to Timothy he says, "Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection; for I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp

authority over the man, but to be in silence." And to the Corinthians, "Let your women keep silence in the churches, for it is not permitted to them to speak; it is a shame for women to speak in the church." The opinion that this is merely intended to "reprove the inconsiderate and talkative women, who troubled the church with their unprofitable questions,"* is altogether a gratuitous assumption.

Equally decisive is scriptural example. Under the Mosaical economy all the priests were men. We read, indeed, both in the Old and New Testament, of women prophesying; but this word has great latitude of meaning, and is often employed in a sense very different from preaching. Sometimes it means nothing more than singing (1 Sam. x. 5, 6; 1 Chron. xxvi.) On extraordinary occasions women were employed by the Holy Spirit to declare his will; but these instances are exceedingly rare: and although in these cases women were under immediate inspiration, yet they never assumed ecclesiastical functions. We never read of a woman delivering a public address, or holding a sacred office, nor was a single book of the Holy Scriptures written by a woman. In the New Testament history we are told that women ministered unto the Saviour; yet he did not select any to be his apostles, nor did a female perform a single miracle. All the apostles, all the evangelists, all the officers of the primitive church were men. "But are not male and female one in Christ Jesus?" Yes; but how do you prove that this text has any reference to the Christian ministry? "Had not Philip four daughters that prophesied?" Yes; but did they publicly preach? "Did not Priscilla, as well as Aquila, instruct Apollos?" Could they not have done that in their parlour? "Was not St. Paul accompanied by females, that laboured with him in the gospel?" Can we not say the same of our female Sunday-school teachers, and of our female religious societies? "But did not Joel predict that our daughters, as well as our sons, should prophesy?" Yes; and St. Peter declared that that prophecy was fulfilled; and yet there is no instance on record of a woman preaching. Is it not

* Barclay's Apology for the Quakers, p. 328.

evident, therefore, that the word prophesy did not mean to preach?

Whenever allusion is made in the sacred writings to the Christian ministry, it is generally made in terms which manifestly exclude the fair sex—"Of the *men* who have companied with us," says St. Peter, "must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection." "If a *man*," says St. Paul to Timothy, "desire the office of a Bishop, he desireth a good work. A Bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, not given to wine, no striker: one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity. Likewise must the Deacons be grave: even so must *their wives* be grave. Rebuke not an elder, but entreat him as a *father*." To Titus he also says, that a Bishop must be "blameless, the husband of one wife."

Could language such as this be used with propriety if women were eligible to these offices? Would it not, to say the least, have been exceedingly unguarded? But, it will be said, the chief, if not the sole qualification for exercising the office of a Christian teacher, consists in a call to the ministry by the Holy Spirit; and if this call be given to a person of the female sex, it is a sufficient warrant to that person for exercising the office of a preacher. Impressed with this sentiment, Barclay speaks very contemptuously of what are deemed the necessary qualifications of a minister—"While the pure learning of the spirit of truth is despised and neglected and made ineffectual, man's fallen earthly wisdom is upheld. And so he that is to be a minister must learn this *art* or *trade*, that he may acquire a trick from a verse of Scripture, by adding his own barren notions and conceptions to it; and his uncertain conjectures, and what he hath stolen out of books (for which end he must have of necessity a good many by him), and may each *Sabbath-day* (as they call it), or oftener, make a discourse for an hour long; and so the devil may be as good and as able a preacher as the best of them, for he has better skill in *languages*, and more *logic*, *philosophy*, and *school-divinity* than any of them; and knows the truth in

the notion better than they all, and can talk more eloquently than all those preachers. But what availeth all this?" In reply, it may be remarked, that we do not believe that gifts, whether natural or acquired, constitute of themselves a call to the Christian ministry: and not only do we believe that a minister of Christ possesses those ordinary communications of the Spirit which are enjoyed by every genuine disciple, but that he is, moreover, "moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon him that office."* But we contend, that as the operation of the Holy Spirit on the mind cannot be inconsistent with the written word, and the written word which expressly excludes females, therefore we are justified in concluding that this spiritual call is never given to a female. If Barclay's idea of the Christian ministry were correct, we should confer no great honour on the fair sex by admitting them to this office, when, according to him, scarcely a single intellectual excellence is necessary for its discharge. Could he think it was necessary to degrade the office of a Christian minister to so low a standard in order to bring it on a level with the female capacity?

IV. Why not?—Are not females *admitted to the highest degree of sovereign authority*, and does not the history of female sovereigns prove they have been as well qualified as the other sex for exercising their high dignity? And if women are able to fill with honour an office of such paramount importance as that of a monarch, are they to be deemed unable to become the pastor of a congregation? Are not church livings often in the hands of women? and do not you acknowledge that in England the sovereign is the head of the church? And where is the consistency of allowing females (like Queen Elizabeth and Queen Anne) to exercise supreme ecclesiastical authority, and yet excluding them from the subordinate offices?

Female sovereigns have been comparatively few. In ancient times, when the head of the state was the leader of the army, females were necessarily excluded from the throne. The alteration in manners, and the difference in the mode of

* Apology for the Quakers, pp. 315, 316.

conducting national affairs, render in our times this exclusion less necessary. As lenity and moderation are now the most desirable virtues in a monarch, the sceptre may safely be confided to a female hand. But though females are admitted in our country to assume the sceptre in default of the male branch of the family, yet in France and Germany they are altogether excluded, by the operation of the Salic law. But the right of governing in this country, which is very properly granted them, by no means argues either a right or a qualification for discharging the office of a Christian minister. The two offices are widely different—in the one case we may consult our convenience ; in the other, we must be governed by Scripture. A female sovereign may appoint a deputy to supply her place, in regard to those duties from the performance of which she is excluded by her sex ; but the duties of a Christian minister cannot be performed by proxy.

Those who contend for placing females at the head of the church, and yet exclude them from the subordinate offices, are chargeable with no greater inconsistency than those who allow females to be sovereigns, and yet exclude them from being excise officers. Some church-livings, it is true, are in the hands of women ; but this does not entitle them to the performance of religious services.

Both natural and revealed religion assure us, that man and woman are intended to occupy different stations in society. Each sex has its peculiar merits ; and as both may attain different branches of excellence, there is no rivalry between them ; each is more dependent on the other, and hence they become more closely united. The intrusion of either sex into the province of the other should always be prevented. The pulpit is one of those posts of authority to which females should have no access. A woman with a beard would not be a more unnatural object.

Immense are the advantages that the Christian religion has conferred on the fair sex. We have only to take a map of the world, and mark out those countries in which woman is not a slave, and these will be the boundaries of the extension of Christianity. But our holy religion, while it delivered the

more feeble from the tyranny of the more powerful, was never intended to confound the different orders which either nature or government has established in society. In the New Testament, subjects are commanded to render obedience to the higher powers, and women are prohibited from usurping authority over the man.

Nothing that has been said is intended to diminish the respect which is due to the female sex. We would not abstract a single ray from the silver glory which surrounds their character. Though man is the lord, he is the protector of woman. He fights for her defence—he labours for her support—and he braves the ocean that she may enjoy the luxuries of distant climes. It was the seed of the woman that bruised the serpent's head. Women were the most ardent and the most constant attendants of the Saviour; they followed him to the tomb, and first witnessed his resurrection. To them we must go for the brightest exhibitions of Christian feeling. It is they who are the chief support of those religious and charitable institutions by which our country is distinguished: and although they are not permitted to be the public instructors of the church, they often teach those by whom the church is taught. Many a minister whose glory has cast a splendour on the Christian world has acknowledged, with gratitude, that the fires of his genius, his piety, and his zeal, were first enkindled by a mother's care, and were raised to their elevation by the gentle breath of maternal instruction.

VIII.—THE SUPERIORITY OF PREACHING AS A MEANS OF IMPARTING RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION TO PAGAN, POPISH, AND OTHER UNENLIGHTENED NATIONS.—ITS DIVINE AUTHORITY.

"THE whole world lieth in wickedness," was the language of St. John. And although in the present day there is much to exhilarate Christian hope, yet when we consider the vast numerical disproportion which even now exists between the disciples of truth and of error—between the subjects of vital

godliness and of degrading vice, we feel strongly disposed to adopt the sentiment of the apostle. When we find nations, teeming with population, wholly given to idolatry; when we see extensive countries subject to the followers of the false prophet; when we view a majority of the inhabitants of Europe falling down and worshipping the image of the beast; and behold above one-third of the population of these favoured isles slaves to the same awful delusion,—we feel that we have no trifling foes to contend against; but that, like the apostles, we have to "wrestle against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places."

The present age is remarkable for the strenuous exertions which are made by the followers of the Saviour for the extension of his kingdom among men. New institutions are raised for the dissemination, both at home and abroad, of the principles of pure and unadulterated Christianity. Every means which human sagacity or evangelical zeal could supply has been called into exercise. Christians of various sects have forgotten their differences, and have formed an alliance against the general foe.

Far be it from us to cast the slightest censure on those who are engaged in any department of Christian benevolence; but there is one feature of the present times which has occasioned in our minds some feelings of regret. We have observed that the religious world, in carrying into execution their benevolent designs, seem to overlook *the importance of preaching.* Schools, Translations, Tracts, Bible Societies—these are the means in praise of which our ears are stunned, and the pulpit is considered merely as the instrument of collecting the money with which these operations are to be carried on. It appears to be forgotten that the preaching of the gospel is not only the most efficient method of maintaining the life and spirit of religion where Christianity is established, but is also the most effectual means of introducing the truth where it was not previously known. We wish to recall the public attention to a consideration of this

important subject. We wish to remind them that PREACHING is the appointed means of propagating the gospel, and hence those societies which employ this means have the strongest claim on our support. In doing this, we shall endeavour to demonstrate the following propositions:—

First Proposition.—PREACHING is that means of imparting religious instruction which has *pre-eminently received the sanction of Divine authority.*

Second Proposition.—PREACHING, independent of its Divine appointment, *is the most efficient means of exhibiting the truths of religion.*

Third Proposition.—PREACHING, viewed simply as an instrument of moral persuasion apart from religion, is *the most effectual means of inducing the human mind to embrace a system of truth.*

Fourth Proposition.—PREACHING is that means of imparting religious instruction which *is best adapted to the actual condition of unenlightened nations.*

A consideration of the *first* of these propositions will be the subject of the present essay.

First Proposition.—PREACHING is that means of imparting religious instruction which has pre-eminently received the sanction of Divine authority. In proof of which we observe:—

I. Preaching is that means of imparting religious instruction the *use of which is enjoined by a positive command.* It is the duty of every Christian to do all the good he can, and by every lawful means in his power; but he may naturally expect a larger portion of success when engaged in the use of those means which are pointed out in the sacred volume. Nearly all our present ways of circulating Christian knowledge are in some degree countenanced by the examples of the ancient church. Colleges for the instruction of those who are intended for the Christian ministry, are *supposed* to be sanctioned by the assemblies of the sons of the prophets under the care of Elijah and Elisha, and by the band of our Saviour's companions, who have been called a College of Apostles. The translation of the Scriptures into other tongues

is *countenanced* by the conduct of the New Testament writers, who always made their quotations from the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Old Testament. The duty of circulating the Scriptures is *inferred* from the command to search them. The writing of religious tracts is *supposed* to be authorized by the inspired writings of the apostles. Schools have no scriptural warrant. Before the art of printing was discovered, none but the learned could read, and manuscripts were so expensive, that none but the rich could purchase. But although these different ways of doing good appear to be countenanced by Scripture example, yet were we called upon to defend any of them, we would ground our defence on their necessity and their utility, rather than rest our argument on these slender analogies.

But in defending *preaching*, we take the high ground of Scripture. Preaching is expressly commanded. Here we have nothing to do with utility or expediency. Woe unto us if we *preach* not the gospel. The apostolic commission runs thus—"Go ye into all the world, and *preach* the gospel to every creature." In the days of his flesh, when our Saviour sent forth his disciples, "they went out and *preached* that men should repent." The appointment of the apostles was, that they might be preachers—"And he ordained twelve, that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to *preach*." When St. Paul traces the design of God in his conversion, he says: "Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should *preach* among the gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ." To the Corinthians he says: "It *pleased God* by the foolishness of *preaching* to save them that believe. We *preach* Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God." In his salutation to Titus he writes: "In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began; but hath in due times manifested his word *through preaching*, which is committed unto me according to the *commandment* of God our Saviour."

II. Preaching is that means of imparting religious instruction which *was exclusively sanctioned by the example of Christ and his Apostles.*

Our LORD was exclusively a preacher: he was neither a school-teacher, a translator, nor an author. It was under the character of a *preacher* that he was the subject of ancient prophecy—"The Lord hath anointed me to *preach* good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to *proclaim* liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to *proclaim* the acceptable year of the Lord."

During the course of his public ministry, "he went throughout every village *preaching* and showing the glad tidings of the kingdom of God."

The holy *Apostles* followed the example of their Lord; they went everywhere *preaching* the word. As the best means of procuring a congregation, they spoke publicly in the synagogues of the Jews; but when they could not procure large congregations, they preached to small ones; when they could not address a multitude, they addressed individuals. When St. Paul came to Athens, he saw the city given wholly to idolatry; the common people sunk in grossness; the philosophers elated with ideas of their own superiority, and prepared to defend, with the most subtle sophistry, the errors they had espoused; immorality spread through every rank; a civil court established, which took cognizance of religious opinions; a people who had in preceding years condemned to death the virtuous Socrates, whose departure from the established creed was far less than that of the apostle. We cannot imagine more hopeless or more dangerous circumstances in which a missionary can be placed. But how did the apostle act? Did he retire to his study and employ himself in translating the Holy Scriptures? Did he send to Judæa for manuscripts which he might distribute? Did he open a school under the pleasing idea that heathen parents would send their children to be instructed in the truths of Christianity? Did he compose and circulate religious tracts? No; he did none of these things. "He *preached* unto them

Jesus and the resurrection"—"He disputed in the synagogue with the Jews and with the devout persons, and in the market daily with them that met with him."

In describing the progress of the apostles in spreading the knowledge of the truth, the sacred writers employ terms which apply exclusively to public preaching. We are told, "They *testified*,"—"they *exhorted*,"—they *expounded*,"—"they *disputed*,"—expressions which evidently refer to oral discussion. St. Paul attaches more importance to preaching than even to the administration of the sacraments—"I was not sent to *baptize*, but to *preach* the gospel." If, therefore, we acknowledge the example of our Lord and of his disciples to be a rule of conduct for us, it follows that to promote the spread of the gospel, we ought to employ those means which they employed. We ought to *preach:* this is Christ's plan; we acknowledge no higher authority. This was the plan of the apostles; we know of no better examples. Other means of promoting the cause of religion may be usefully employed, but none are equal to this.

III. Preaching is the only means of imparting religious instruction for which *a special miraculous influence was communicated.* Numerous and various were the endowments bestowed by the Holy Spirit on the primitive church. Among these wonderful endowments was the gift of tongues, which was first granted on the day of Pentecost. But for what purpose was this gift bestowed? Was it to enable the apostles to translate the sacred Scriptures into other tongues? Was it to enable them to write tracts in these languages, or to set up schools for the instruction of the young? No such thing. It was to enable them to *preach:* it was that the people might *hear* in the tongues in which they were born the wonderful works of God. We have no account that any of the disciples ever wrote a book in any of the languages which were thus miraculously acquired. Indeed, none of the books of the New Testament were written till several years after the resurrection of our Lord. The success of Christianity, for which this interval was remarkable, was achieved entirely by means of *preaching.*

It is true the churches had the Old Testament Scriptures. These were generally known among the Jews from being read in the synagogues every Sabbath-day; but they were not in the possession of the common people. Judging, then, by the conduct of some Christians in the present day, we should imagine that the Holy Spirit would have exerted his miraculous influences in multiplying copies of the sacred volume. Among the heathen nations, the only version which any of them could read was the Septuagint, a translation of the Hebrew writings into the Greek tongue. The Greek was the learned language among the Romans, as the Latin is with us. The educated part of the Roman nation could therefore have read the Septuagint had it been put into their hands; but not only the mass of the Roman people, but most of the nations uuder their dominion, were as ignorant of the Greek as they were of the original Hebrew. Here, again, we should suppose that the Holy Spirit would have directed his servants to translate the Scriptures into all these different languages. But we find that not merely the chief, but the *sole* instrument which in the first ages of Christianity the Great Head of the Church thought fit to employ for the extension of his kingdom, was the *preaching of the word.* For this purpose, and for this alone, he endowed his servants with the miraculous gift of tongues. Whatever he does is right. He is excellent in counsel, and wonderful in working. Equally easy would it have been for him to multiply the copies of the sacred Scriptures, to have translated them into every tongue spoken under heaven, and to have endowed every individual with the faculty of reading; but his wisdom thought proper to employ, as the means of carrying on his purposes, the *preaching* of the gospel, and he has thus set us an example that we should follow his steps.

IV. Preaching is that means of imparting religious instruction which the *Holy Spirit has honoured with the greatest success.* If in the pursuit of an object one means which we employ is *uniformly* attended with greater success than any other, it proves that this means is better adapted to obtain the end in view. But all our success in the promulgation of

the gospel is in consequence of Divine influence. If, therefore, this means has been attended with greater success than any other, it is an indication of the Divine will, and proves that is this the means which God has appointed for the purpose of enlarging and establishing his church. It is needless to refer to the success of the gospel in times of the apostles, to the reformation from Popery, to the revival of religion by Wesley and Whitfield, and to various other events, to show the superior success which has attended the *preaching* of the word. When we talk of School Societies and Bible Societies going forth as pioneers, to prepare the way for the preaching of the gospel, we are completely reversing the order of things. Christianity has preceded civilization more frequently than civilization has preceded Christianity. Nothing can be more chimerical than to suppose that a man will take the trouble of learning to read merely that he may be able to understand the principles of a religion which he believes to be false. Let us suppose that our labours are so successful, that every individual is taught to read, and has a Bible in his possession,—are we warranted to expect that religion will *necessarily* flourish? Look at the anti-evangelical classes of our own country; they can read, they have Bibles,—are they distinguished for their piety? Are not religious books the books of which they know the least, and is not the Bible a mere family register? We are much too sanguine when we anticipate that even the *complete success* of our Bible and School Societies will *necessarily* promote the interest of vital religion. Judging by those classes who are already educated, we cannot expect that even universal education, apart from religious instruction, will very much improve the state of morals, or be very favourable to the cause of religion.

The state of Scotland is perpetually referred to as a proof of the moral effects of universal education. We are not disposed to deny that education has done much for Scotland, but we contend that the *preaching of the gospel* has done more. Scotland, ever since the Reformation, has been blessed, both in her seceding and her established churches, with the advantage of a zealous evangelical ministry. It is

to the labours of these holy men that religion and morals, and even education itself, have been indebted for their progress. The state of Scotland, therefore, is an instance of the happy success of preaching.

In tracing the progress of the gospel at home, we find it is always by means of *preaching*. An evangelist procures a building in some benighted village. He preaches—a congregation is assembled—the word is accompanied with power—a church is formed—the sacraments are administered; and then arise Sunday-schools, Associations for the relief of the sick, and Auxiliary Societies to support more extended institutions.

If, then, *preaching* is sanctioned by the express command of God, the example of Christ and his apostles, the miraculous outpouring of the Spirit, and the Divine success which has attended its ministration, is not our duty clearly pointed out? Is it not evident that this is the means which we are bound to employ in our contest against ignorance and superstition? Preaching is the instrument appointed by Heaven for the demolition of the strongholds of Satan; it is a weapon from the armoury of God. If we employ other means to the neglect of this, we are seeking success in a way in which we are not warranted to expect it, and are presenting to angels and to men an exhibition, not of our piety, but of our presumption.

IX.—THE SUPERIORITY OF PREACHING AS A MEANS OF IMPARTING RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION TO PAGAN, POPISH, AND OTHER UNENLIGHTENED NATIONS.—ITS EFFICIENCY.

In our last essay, we demonstrated that "preaching is that means of imparting religious instruction which has preeminently received the sanction of Divine authority." We proved this by showing that the use of preaching was enjoined by a positive command; that it was exclusively sanctioned by Christ and his apostles; that it is the means for the exercise of which a special miraculous influence was communicated; and that the Holy Spirit had honoured it with the greatest success. We shall now proceed to the demonstration of our second proposition.

Preaching, independent of its Divine appointment, is the most efficient means of exhibiting the truths of religion.

But it will be said, Why prove this? If you have proved your first proposition, that preaching is the means appointed by God for the conversion of man, must not this second proposition be unnecessary? Whatever He does is best; and if He has selected and appointed this means, does not that circumstance alone prove that it is the most efficient? Very good; so it does. But still it is profitable to trace the wisdom of the Divine procedure, and to discover that the institutions of his Church are not arbitrary and capricious enactments, but that they exhibit the perfections of Him who is wonderful in counsel and excellent in working. We have also this advantage, that should any persons still question the accuracy of our first proposition, we may convince them of the truth of the second, and hence prevail on them to render their assistance towards supporting the preaching of the gospel.

We shall now, therefore, keep the question of Divine appointment quite out of view. We will suppose we have a command to circulate Christian knowledge, but that the means are left to our own selection. From a comparison of the different means that might be employed, we should endeavour to select the most efficient; and in this case we contend that our selection would fall upon preaching. We shall endeavour to prove our proposition by the following arguments:—

I. Preaching exhibits the truths of religion in a manner *the most likely to engage the attention.*

Nothing argues more strongly the apostasy of man from God than that fatal indifference with which he views his spiritual interests. It is not opposition, it is not persecution that we dread; the Christian Church always flourishes most when in a state of warfare. But the greatest obstacle to the progress of the gospel is indifference. In all ignorant countries the mass of the population are indifferent to religion. It is true they call themselves members of the Established Church, and most devoutly abhor schismatics; but with the doctrines of their own church, and the opinions of these schismatics, they are equally unacquainted. In all *ignorant*

countries, did we say? Would to God none such could be found in the parlours and counting-houses of Great Britain! To remove this mental apathy, to stimulate inquiry and fix attention, is the first object we must have in view; and this end is most effectually attained by preaching.

The erection of a church or a chapel, and the other circumstances attending the introduction of a gospel ministry into a benighted neighbourhood, have a tendency to excite notice. People who are indifferent about religion like to know the business of their neighbours. They make inquiries about the preacher Who is he? Where does he come from? To what sect does he belong? What doctrines does he preach? What sort of a man is he? These are questions which every one asks. To satisfy their curiosity, they go to hear; they form different opinions of his discourse, and by their eager discussions the chapel is filled.

One great cause of this religious indifference is, an aversion to mental exertion—to read, to think, to study, to reflect; this is labour. It is much easier to condemn without examination than to take the trouble to understand. Studious habits are alleged to be unfriendly to a vigorous engagement in the active pursuits of life. But still such persons will hear a man speak for an hour; there is no labour in this. The mind becomes gradually interested, and pursues a tract of meditation into which it could never have been persuaded deliberately to engage. The manners of an agreeable preacher are more adapted to attract the feelings of an individual than though you were to give him a book and tell him to read. "There is something more sprightly, more delightful and entertaining in the living discourse of a wise, a learned, and well-qualified teacher, than there is in the silent and sedentary practice of reading. The very turn of voice and good pronunciation, and the polite and alluring manner which some teachers have attained, *will engage the attention*, keep the soul fixed, and convey and insinuate into the mind the ideas of things in a more lively and forcible way than the mere reading of books in the silence and retirement of the closet." *

* Watts's Improvement of the Mind, Part I., chap. ii.

We have hitherto supposed that these indifferent persons are capable of reading; but what if they are not? Must we wait till they have learned to read before we address them on the momentous concerns of religion? Will it be said that a man cannot understand the truths of religion till he has learned to read? What then? Do literary acquirements *create* a mental capacity? Are there not thousands of Irish peasants who cannot read, and who have yet a wonderful shrewdness and promptness of intellect? By what mode of reasoning can it be proved that the art of reading is more essential to salvation than the art of painting? By what way can we engage the attention of the illiterate adults but by preaching? and, to insure this, must we not preach at once? for before we shall be enabled to bring into full operation this preparatory machinery of Schools, of Tracts, and of Bible Societies, will not a considerable portion of the present generation be swept from the earth?

II. Preaching *is the most efficient way of explaining the Holy Scriptures.*

Let the most eminent Christian who has spent many years in studying the sacred volume, and has availed himself of all the advantages which literature can supply, recollect how much of that holy book he is still unable to understand; let him calculate the immense difference between his circumstances and those of a benighted papist, or an untutored heathen; and then let him conjecture what difficulties would oppose *their* progress in scriptural knowledge were *they* left wholly destitute of an instructor.

Some of the clouds which, to our view, conceal the temple of revelation, may be removed by human power. Those obscurities which arise from the manners and customs of ancient nations, from the scenery of eastern countries, from the discrepancies of history, or from the idiom of the original tongues, may be removed by literary study; apparent contradictions may be reconciled; and by paraphrase and exposition the Scriptures may be more clearly unfolded.

It is also necessary to *vindicate* the Holy Scriptures from those unworthy sentiments which have been ascribed to them.

We live in a world of ignorance, and the weakness or the wickedness of man has compelled even the oracle of truth to appear to speak the language of error. Were a papist to read the Bible, he would tell his hearers that *repentance* signified *penance*, and that *remission of sins* denoted absolution by the priest. These imputations must be exposed, the veil of error must be removed, and Revelation exhibited in all her native loveliness.

It may be replied that all this may be done without preaching. "If a man have plenty of books, and plenty of time to read them, he may acquire from theological publications all the information he could gain from his minister." Supposing this were true, what connection has it with the subject? We are not speaking of literary men; we are speaking of imparting religious instruction to popish, pagan, and other *unenlightened* nations; and we say that the progress of such persons in scriptural knowledge will be exceedingly tardy if they are left to the silent perusal of the sacred writings without the assistance of an oral instructor.

Even the perusal of the Holy Scriptures may be rendered more profitable by a few previous hints from an experienced friend. It is true that every part of the Bible is important; it is true that every part of the Bible ought to be read; but it is also true that all parts of the Bible are not equally important; nor are all parts of the Bible equally adapted for the *first* perusal of an untutored mind. We are great admirers of the Porteusian Index, and we shall here quote from its Preface:—"In a comprehensive volume like the Bible, embracing as it does the genealogies, ceremonies, laws, and general history of a peculiar people, mingled throughout with the important doctrines and duties of Christianity, it has been acknowledged by eminent bishops, clergymen, and ministers, that some efforts *at selection and arrangement* for the younger classes and *less-informed members of the community* is a desideratum beyond all doubt and reasonable question."—"A reference to those *particular parts* which are immediately calculated to afford *instruction to the ignorant*

will greatly tend to promote an edifying use of the word of God."

We have read somewhere of a missionary who read and explained to his hearers the New Testament. "I had great difficulty," he says, "in causing them to understand the meaning of the word Pharisees, as these people did not know whether they were men or beasts. But the fall of man required considerable explanation, as they were eager to know whether he fell from a rock or from a tree!"

III. Preaching exhibits the truths of religion *in a systematic and comprehensive form.*

In our preceding observations we referred principally to those obscurities which, to an untutored mind, would present themselves in the *language and style* of Scripture. But were the sacred Scriptures written in a style which should preclude the possibility of mistake; were the prophecy, "a wayfaring man, though a fool, shall not err therein," strictly applicable to every part of the sacred volume, that would not supersede the necessity of a Christian ministry.

"The best way," says Dr. Watts, "to learn any science, is to begin with a regular system, or a short or plain scheme of that science well drawn up into a narrow compass, omitting the deeper and more abstruse parts of it, and that also *under the conduct and instruction of some skilful teacher.* Systems are necessary to give an entire and comprehensive view of the several parts of any science which may have a mutual influence towards the explication or proof of each other; whereas, if a man deals always and only in essays and discourses on particular parts of a science, he will never obtain a distinct and just idea of the whole."—"Those who contemplate only the fragments of pieces broken off from any science, dispersed in short, unconnected discourses, and do not discern their relation to each other, and how they may be adopted, and by their union procure the delightful symmetry of a regular scheme, can never survey an entire body of truth."

Let us apply these observations to the subject before us. The science to be taught is theology. This science is con-

tained in the Holy Scriptures, which consist of a great number of "essays and discourses," written at different times by different persons, and addressed to different assemblies. These "essays and discourses," collectively, reveal the whole will of God to man; they contain everything necessary for him either to believe or to practise—everything essential to his present or his future happiness. But, perhaps, not one of these discourses contains the whole of the system, and in none of them is it drawn up in a systematic form. Hence, when we begin to instil the principles of our holy religion into the minds of children, we do not first give them the Bible, and tell them to read, but we draw up an abstract of the truths of religion in the form of a catechism, and under each article we make citations from holy writ, in confirmation of the doctrine. By oral instruction we endeavour to explain more familiarly the principles of the system, and then, by a more enlarged reading of the inspired volume, we conduct the mind into a knowledge of the "deeper and more abstruse parts" of this sacred science.

Should we not pursue a similar method in conveying religious instruction to the mind of an untutored heathen? Should we not announce at once the plan of salvation? Ought we not to declare the guilt and misery of man, and then unfold the method of recovery revealed in the gospel? Should we not explain these things by oral discussion, and point out those *parts* of holy writ in which they are more strikingly exhibited; and thus, by an easy progress, conduct the mind into the knowledge of all truth? And is not this mode of instruction more likely to affect the individual than though some stranger, a thousand miles off, were to send him a Bible, and request him to read? "A tutor or instructor, when he paraphrases and explains other authors, can mark out the precise point of difficulty or controversy, and unfold it. He can show you which paragraphs are of greatest importance, and which are of less moment. He can teach his hearers what authors or what parts of an author are best worth reading on any particular subject, and thus save his

disciples much time and pains by shortening the labours of their closet and private studies. He can show what were the doctrines of the ancients in a compendium which, perhaps, would cost much labour, and the perusal of many books to attain. He can inform you what new doctrines or sentiments are rising in the world before they come to be public, as well as acquaint you with his own private thoughts, and his own experiments and observations, which never were, and perhaps never will be, published to the world, and yet may be very valuable and useful."*

IV. Preaching exhibits the truths of religion in a manner that is *best adapted to the characters and circumstances of the hearers.*

"The preacher," says the author we have previously quoted,† "considers the doctrines and reasons, the precepts, the promises, and threatenings of the word of God, and what are the natural effects of them upon the mind; he considers what is the natural tendency of such a virtue or such a vice; he is well apprised that the representation of some of these things may convince the understanding; some may terrify the conscience, some may allure the slothful, and some encourage the desponding mind; *he observes the temper of his hearers,* or of any particular person that converses with him about things sacred, and he judges what will be the effects of each representation on such persons; he reviews and recollects what have been the effects and methods of his ministry, and, by an early survey of all these, he attains greater degrees of skill in his sacred employment."

The untutored mind is not merely affected with these various circumstances to which other men are subject, but is liable to additional prejudices from the religious system he had previously embraced. To convince an Irish peasant of the errors of Popery would require a mode of address different from that in which we should communicate instruction to an unenlightened Protestant: to convert a Pagan would require a different mode still; and even this would vary

* Watts on the Mind. Part I. chap. ii.

† Ibid. Part I. chap. xix.

according to the particular system of Paganism of which the individual was a disciple. The Christian minister, therefore, is under the necessity of exhibiting Divine truth in a manner adapted to these particular cases.

The state of society in different countries gives rise to peculiar circumstances that call for a particular adaptation of religious instruction. The human mind is affected by forms of government, by political regulations, and even by occupations and pursuits. In Hindostan there are castes; in the West Indies slaves. The late Mr. Smith, of Demerara, appears to have been peculiarly attentive in adapting his pulpit instructions to the circumstances of his hearers. In reply to the charge of preaching from texts adapted to excite the negroes to revolt, he says: "The circumstance of a number of our congregation being advertised for sale by auction, some on the day of the revolt, if I am not mistaken, and others soon after, was the cause of my choosing that text (Christ's lamentation over Jerusalem), as it certainly was on the second Sunday before the revolt. I expected that many of the people would be removed far from the means of religious instruction, and would probably never again enjoy the privilege they had in many cases abused or neglected."*

Human beings advertised for sale is a circumstance not to be met with in our own country, nor is there any *direct* reference in the Holy Scriptures to persons in that unhappy condition. The negro might have looked over his Bible long enough before he would have found a chapter headed thus: "Instructions to Men advertised for Sale." But when such a case occurred in a different state of society, the faithful missionary, by referring to persons placed in similar *religious* circumstances, found no difficulty in imparting instruction adapted to the condition of those he addressed. Here, then, is exhibited the superiority of preaching.

V. Preaching is *the most effectual means of exhibiting and producing the exercise of devotion.*

The devotional exercises of an individual, could they

* Smith's Trial, page 85.

always be correctly ascertained, would furnish us with a good criterion of his piety. It is lamentable to consider how large a portion of mankind live in the constant neglect of this sacred duty. One would imagine that a consciousness of his helplessness or gratitude for his enjoyments would induce every individual to make his daily acknowledgments to the Creator and Preserver of his existence; but, alas! how deplorably erroneous would be such a supposition! Man is estranged from God. How many an individual is totally unmindful of the source of his comforts! In how many a house might we wander from apartment to apartment, and never from any member of the family hear the slightest whisper of a prayer! And in social life, scarcely a young man has courage enough to avow that he prays at all, lest he should expose himself to the senseless witticisms of his profligate companions. Had we not sanctuaries in which public worship was performed, it is to be feared that the very notion of prayer would slip from the recollection of no small part of the community, and they would soon be able to form no idea of its existence.

In attempting to effect the restoration of man, our first endeavour must be to make him a praying being. The breath of prayer is the first symptom of spiritual life. In doing this, have we not an immense superiority in favour of preaching? The solitary reader of the Holy Scriptures will indeed meet with frequent exhortations to prayer; he will find the most beautiful models of devotion; and he will perceive that prayer formed a distinguishing trait in the characters of the greatest and most holy men. But in the sanctuary prayer is not only inculcated; it is more—it is exhibited. An appeal is made not merely to the understanding and the feelings, but also to the senses. There is a contagion of feeling in a public assembly by which an individual is induced to catch in some degree the feelings he perceives to be exhibited in others. When we have carried the gospel into a benighted village, and have induced the untutored inhabitants to attend the services of the sanctuary, to behave with becoming reverence, and to listen with devout attention,

we have done much; but we do not stop here. An observance of the Lord's day necessarily follows. This day was often profaned through idleness, but now a good part of it is taken up by attending the place of worship; and the intervals are occupied with conversation on the sermons, the perusal of suitable books, pious meditation, or the instruction of the junior members of the family. It instantly occurs to the most unenlightened mind, that to spend a part of this holy day in the public worship of God, and the other in the service of sinful pleasure, would be an act of the greatest inconsistency.

One great advantage of the introduction of preaching into a benighted village is, that by this means persons who are religiously disposed are brought acquainted with each other: they gather strength by increasing numbers. An individual in these circumstances, who had been the subject of religious impressions, would not, perhaps, if he stood alone, have sufficient courage to avow his convictions; but he is stimulated by others. The little band unite and increase; and their neighbours treat them with respect, knowing that an attack upon any one member would be regarded as an attack on the whole body.

The effects of preaching are visible in promoting a spirit of prayer. Before, the individual knew not how to pray, and perhaps was ashamed to engage; but he hears the duty of prayer explained—he is taught how far the devotional exercises of Scripture are applicable to himself—he joins in the prayers of his minister, and he becomes himself a man of prayer. Hence we generally find, that soon after the introduction of a preacher into a village, prayer-meetings are established—admirable institutions, in which humble talent has first been elicited, and piety has gathered strength, and which have often proved nurseries for the Christian ministry. All this is the effect of preaching.

VI. By preaching, *the truths of religion are accompanied with the force of example.*

Preaching of course implies a preacher. When a person reproves the principles or practice of others, he must expect

that his own conduct will be narrowly watched. If he do not conform to his own doctrine, his message will be treated with indifference, and his person exposed to contempt. If his conduct be an exemplification of his precepts, he will receive respect even from those who may not adopt his instructions. When the Missionary Society was formed, it was objected that the missionaries would be five years before they could acquire foreign languages, so as to enable them to preach. "Well," said a minister, "these five years will not be lost; for during that time they will be *living* the gospel, and then they will begin to *preach* the gospel."

The Holy Scriptures present us with the finest models of virtue and piety. Most of these, however, were public characters, and would not, perhaps, by a humble individual, be considered as proper examples for his imitation. But the Christian preacher is placed in circumstances similar to his own. He can view the labours of this holy man—the earnestness of his address—his anxiety for the salvation of his flock—his attention to the young—his attendance at the bedside of the sick—all his conduct marked by integrity and benevolence: he sees, and exclaims, "That religion which makes such men, must be good."

There never yet appeared on earth a thinking *nation.* The intellectual part of the community have always been those who have had a better education, more leisure, or are in more easy circumstances than others. Hence the generality of men judge of the goodness or badness of a religion more by the conduct of its professors than by an examination of its principles. And hence it is that a bad system of religion has sometimes been supported by the comparative good conduct of its disciples. It cannot be denied that some of the Popish priests in Ireland have acted with a degree of zeal and sympathy which have recommended their faith to the attachment of the people. Quakerism has been supported in a similar way. If, then, an unblemished conduct can recommend even a false or erroneous system of religion, what may we not expect when it shall be exhibited in behalf of pure evangelical truth?

It is in the Christian Preacher that this character is most strikingly exhibited. A schoolmaster, or a tract distributor, is not placed in circumstances so friendly to the exercise of his graces; he has not the same opportunity of calling into operation the excellences he may possess. A preacher is a more public character; he is treated with greater respect; he is the subject of general observation. The light of the gospel displayed in his conduct illuminates all around: it so shines before men, that others, seeing his good works, glorify their Father who is in heaven.

Thus have we endeavoured to prove our second proposition, that, independently of its divine appointment, preaching is the most efficient means of exhibiting the truths of *religion.* And if to engage the attention to religious subjects—to explain the Holy Scriptures—to exhibit in a lucid form the plan of salvation—to adapt gospel truth to the characters and circumstances of the hearers—to exhibit and produce the exercise of devotion—and to enforce religion by the power of example; if these are the ways in which religious truth should be exhibited, then have we proved the superiority of preaching.

X.—THE SUPERIORITY OF PREACHING AS A MEANS OF IMPARTING RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION TO PAGAN, POPISH, AND OTHER UNENLIGHTENED NATIONS.—ITS INFLUENCE.

In our last two essays we endeavoured to prove, first, that preaching is that means of imparting religious instruction which has *pre-eminently received the sanction of divine authority*; and, secondly, that preaching, independently of its divine appointment, is *the most efficient means of exhibiting the truths of religion.*

We shall now proceed to the demonstration of our third proposition; viz., that preaching, viewed simply as a means of moral persuasion apart from religion, is the most effectual means of inducing the human mind to embrace a system of truth.

When we wish to convince another person of the truth of

any proposition, it is necessary we should adopt the following means. We must state the arguments in favour of our sentiment, and we must answer the objections to which it may be exposed. We must show its application to the peculiar circumstances of our hearers. We should give interest and force to our arguments, by gathering illustrations from the circumstances of the occasion. Our opponents should be convinced that we are sincerely desirous of their welfare, and our whole discourse should be conducted in the most agreeable and conciliating manner. Let us examine how far preaching possesses these advantages.

1. Preaching is the most effectual means of stating the arguments in favour of the truths of religion.

The great difference between religion and superstition is, that the former is founded on reason, the latter on credulity. A system of doctrines may be styled a religious system; but if it will not bear examination and controversy, it is certainly a system of error. Hence, in introducing a new faith, we must first attempt to enlighten the understanding. Although we may be able to draw up a statement of the main truths of our holy religion, accompanied by the arguments by which they are defended, and place it in the hands of those whom we wish to instruct by means of a printed book, yet this mode of instruction, even in this point of view, is inferior to preaching. In writing a book or a tract, we attempt to compress our ideas within the narrowest limits; but preaching admits of a diffuseness, both of style and of amplification, which is better calculated to present to an untutored mind the principles of the gospel in a lucid point of view. A degree of tautology, which in print we should be anxious to avoid, may here be permitted. The same truth may be repeated in different words, or represented under a variety of forms; so that every hearer, by one representation or another, may arrive to a perfect comprehension of the subject. Preaching has also an advantage from its frequent repetition. When a tract is once read, we feel little inclination to read it again; but a sermon, though it be a repetition of the sentiments expressed in a previous discourse, is much less irk-

some. To those who have had no previous instruction it is necessary to give line upon line, and precept upon precept; for when for the time they ought to be teachers, they have need that one teach them again what are the first principles of the oracles of God.

2. Preaching is the most effectual means of refuting those objections to which the truths of religion are exposed.

You give a man a Bible or a tract. He reads, and starts objections against some part of it. How are these objections to be removed? The book cannot speak. Every system of false religion will give rise to different classes of objections against the true. Every individual, by his previous associations, his education, or his habits of thinking, will be prompted to advance a variety of cavils. How can these objections be so effectually refuted as by the minister of the gospel? By intercourse with the people, he knows with what objections his message will most likely be assailed. These objections are then publicly stated and refuted. Hence they who indulged these hostile sentiments are convinced, and they who never before heard these objections are forearmed against those attacks to which they may be subjected.

When we recollect that the Holy Scriptures were written many centuries ago—that they were written in countries whose habits and manners were different from our own, and that our present version is a translation from a foreign tongue, we shall not be charged with casting any reflection on the sacred volume, by contending that, on account of these circumstances, it is liable to objections which the untutored mind is not able to solve. And when we farther recollect that the sacred writings unfold mysteries far beyond all human comprehension, and which are exceedingly humbling to the pride of man, we shall cease to be astonished that the Bible should be rejected on account of its mysteries. Let the most experienced Christian, who has had the advantage of commentaries, of religious books, of friendly conference, and even of the preaching of the gospel; let him recollect how many parts of the sacred volume are as a sealed book to his mind; let him recollect how many diffi-

any proposition, it is necessary we should adopt the following means. We must state the arguments in favour of our sentiment, and we must answer the objections to which it may be exposed. We must show its application to the peculiar circumstances of our hearers. We should give interest and force to our arguments, by gathering illustrations from the circumstances of the occasion. Our opponents should be convinced that we are sincerely desirous of their welfare, and our whole discourse should be conducted in the most agreeable and conciliating manner. Let us examine how far preaching possesses these advantages.

1. Preaching is the most effectual means of stating the arguments in favour of the truths of religion.

The great difference between religion and superstition is, that the former is founded on reason, the latter on credulity. A system of doctrines may be styled a religious system; but if it will not bear examination and controversy, it is certainly a system of error. Hence, in introducing a new faith, we must first attempt to enlighten the understanding. Although we may be able to draw up a statement of the main truths of our holy religion, accompanied by the arguments by which they are defended, and place it in the hands of those whom we wish to instruct by means of a printed book, yet this mode of instruction, even in this point of view, is inferior to preaching. In writing a book or a tract, we attempt to compress our ideas within the narrowest limits; but preaching admits of a diffuseness, both of style and of amplification, which is better calculated to present to an untutored mind the principles of the gospel in a lucid point of view. A degree of tautology, which in print we should be anxious to avoid, may here be permitted. The same truth may be repeated in different words, or represented under a variety of forms; so that every hearer, by one representation or another, may arrive to a perfect comprehension of the subject. Preaching has also an advantage from its frequent repetition. When a tract is once read, we feel little inclination to read it again; but a sermon, though it be a repetition of the sentiments expressed in a previous discourse, is much less irk-

some. To those who have had no previous instruction it is necessary to give line upon line, and precept upon precept; for when for the time they ought to be teachers, they have need that one teach them again what are the first principles of the oracles of God.

2. Preaching is the most effectual means of refuting those objections to which the truths of religion are exposed.

You give a man a Bible or a tract. He reads, and starts objections against some part of it. How are these objections to be removed? The book cannot speak. Every system of false religion will give rise to different classes of objections against the true. Every individual, by his previous associations, his education, or his habits of thinking, will be prompted to advance a variety of cavils. How can these objections be so effectually refuted as by the minister of the gospel? By intercourse with the people, he knows with what objections his message will most likely be assailed. These objections are then publicly stated and refuted. Hence they who indulged these hostile sentiments are convinced, and they who never before heard these objections are forearmed against those attacks to which they may be subjected.

When we recollect that the Holy Scriptures were written many centuries ago—that they were written in countries whose habits and manners were different from our own, and that our present version is a translation from a foreign tongue, we shall not be charged with casting any reflection on the sacred volume, by contending that, on account of these circumstances, it is liable to objections which the untutored mind is not able to solve. And when we farther recollect that the sacred writings unfold mysteries far beyond all human comprehension, and which are exceedingly humbling to the pride of man, we shall cease to be astonished that the Bible should be rejected on account of its mysteries. Let the most experienced Christian, who has had the advantage of commentaries, of religious books, of friendly conference, and even of the preaching of the gospel; let him recollect how many parts of the sacred volume are as a sealed book to his mind; let him recollect how many diffi-

stance operated powerfully in his favour, and induced the Pharisees to undertake his defence, and to save him from destruction. When the same apostle was walking through the streets of Athens, he observed an altar with this inscription—"To THE UNKNOWN GOD." He did not forget this circumstance in his subsequent address; and we may judge of the intense interest of his audience, when, standing on Mars Hill, he exclaimed to the assembled multitude, "Whom ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you." Had he remained at Jerusalem, and written tracts for the perusal of the Athenians, he would have been unacquainted with the existence of such an altar, and have consequently been unable to avail himself of the impression which an allusion to it could not fail to produce.

But the most striking instance of local scenery and attendant circumstances being employed to give greater effect to public instruction, were exhibited in the person of our Saviour himself. His discourses abound with allusions of this description. Sometimes the political circumstances, or the ceremonies of the Mosaic law; at other times the peculiar events of the day, or even the operations of domestic life, furnish the occasion of imparting instructions respecting the kingdom of heaven. When walking through the fields, he directed the attention of his disciples to the birds of the air, the lilies of the field, the sower scattering the seed, the trees clothed with verdure, the fields whitening to the harvest; and scenes such as these were made the vehicles of sacred truth. When invited to an entertainment, the leaven cast into the meal, the desire to procure the upper seat, the feast made at the marriage of the king's son, and the happy return of the prodigal, were the topics of his address. When he saw the rich casting their gifts into the treasury, he discoursed on the nature and principle of benevolence. When they showed him the goodly stones of the temple, he directed their attention to his death and resurrection. It was thus, by a prompt and agreeable allusion to the circumstances around him, that his words found a ready and welcome access to the mind of his hearers.

In the present day, the Christian Preacher will often be placed in situations where, by a judicious use of attendant circumstances, he will be able to obtain for gospel truth a more easy access to the heart. Even ordinary occurrences of an afflictive or joyous nature, have on individual minds an influence which induces them more readily to attend to the instructions of religion. By no other means than preaching can these favourable opportunities be so advantageously improved.

5. Preaching gives the hearers an opportunity of forming a judgment of the speaker's sincerity.

It is in vain for us to attempt to convince others of the truth of a proposition, if they are aware that we do not believe it ourselves. Our hearers may acknowledge that we are ingenious disputers, but they will never admit the truth of our doctrine. By reading a book, we have but slender materials for judging of the sincerity of the author. We cannot always judge of a man by his works: a vicious man may write in dispraise of vice, one who is cruel will inculcate humanity, and another who is avaricious will exhort to benevolence. Few of our eminent writers have, in their private conduct, been such as we would recommend to the imitation of our children. But we can judge much better of a person's sincerity when we hear him speak. We see his earnestness; we witness his zeal; we are biased in his favour. The fervent exhortations of a living advocate have a much greater influence on the bulk of mankind than the silent eloquence of a printed book. What, then, must the preacher be impassioned? Would you have him give way to enthusiasm? If by enthusiasm is meant the prostration of the intellect to the dominion of the imagination, we say no—the Christian Preacher must not be an enthusiast; but if by enthusiasm is meant fervent zeal, we reply yes—he must be an enthusiast, and it is the loudest and clearest call of *reason* that he should be an enthusiast. He must call to the heavens from above, and to the earth beneath, to show unto the house of Jacob their transgression, and to the house of Israel their sin. He must do this with a warmth and an energy becoming the

importance of his office—a warmth corresponding to the danger to which his hearers are exposed. Go tell the mother to cherish the infant that she loves so tenderly, but never to indulge angry feelings against those who would injure its person or dispraise its charms; tell the patriot to hurl tyranny from its throne, and to dash in pieces the rod of oppression, but never to utter the language of indignation; tell the bard to mount on the wings of poetic genius, but at the same time to restrain his feelings; tell the philanthropist to wander over half the world for the purpose of alleviating the pressure of human woe, but to do it without emotion: do this, and then expect that the ambassador of heaven will plead with cold indifference the cause of religion. Away with frigid disquisitions—

> "I venerate the man *whose heart is warm,*
> Whose hands are pure, whose doctrine and whose life,
> Coincident, exhibit lucid proof
> That he is honest in the sacred cause."

6. By preaching, we are enabled to state our arguments in the most conciliating and agreeable manner.

A missionary who attempts to induce enlightened nations to embrace a system of religion different from that in which they have been educated, will no doubt meet with many difficulties. In proportion as men are ignorant, in such proportion are they obstinate. When these obstinate persons have their principles strengthened by habit, and sanctioned not only by the conduct of their ancestors, but also by the example of all around them, it is not surprising that they should at first reject propositions so revolting to their previous sentiments. The Abbé Dubois has observed (and probably in this case with truth), that a Hindoo, who has been taught that it is unlawful to eat animal food, must be astonished at the sacrifices under the law, and would immediately conclude that such an institution could not be divine. An Irish peasant, were he told at once that his priest was a man who was not only destitute of the power of working miracles, but was the agent of an antichristian system, would immediately be roused into indignation. There are cases in which the

Christian teacher has need both of the wisdom of the serpent and the harmlessness of the dove. We must not suppose that because the religion we preach is true that therefore it will be immediately embraced. Light itself will produce painful sensations on organs which have long been inured to darkness. Although we have on our side the influences of Almighty power, yet those influences are communicated in the use of suitable means, not in a presumptuous rejection of them. We must, therefore, endeavour to conciliate; untutored minds must be treated as children; our attacks on their prejudices must be gradual and inoffensive, and we must endeavour to convince our hearers that we earnestly desire their happiness. An oral instructor has in this respect a great advantage over one that would teach from the press. Even in the address of a speaker who is endeavouring to convince those he loves of the truth of a sentiment he believes important to their welfare, there is an attractive manner, a winning softness, which cannot be transcribed into print. The eye, the countenance, the tone of voice, these are often more eloquent than the words which are uttered. This is natural language, which can be understood and felt by all. Its influence depends not on the choice of words, the collocation of phrases, or the correctness of translations. Gentle as the dews of heaven descending on the herbage of the field, the instructions of such a teacher drop on the willing attention of his hearers, and win their way to the inmost recesses of the soul.

XI.—THE SUPERIORITY OF PREACHING AS A MEANS OF IMPARTING RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION TO PAGAN, POPISH, AND OTHER UNENLIGHTENED NATIONS.—ITS ADAPTATION.

In discussing this subject, we proposed to demonstrate these four propositions:—

First.—Preaching is that means of imparting religious instruction which has pre-eminently received the sanction of divine authority.

Secondly.—Preaching, independently of its divine appoint-

ment, is the most efficient means of exhibiting the truths of religion.

Thirdly.—Preaching, viewed simply as an instrument of moral persuasion, is the most effectual means of inducing the human mind to embrace a system of truth.

Fourthly.—Preaching is that means of imparting religious instruction which is best adapted to the actual condition of unenlightened nations.

The first three of these propositions have been considered: we shall now proceed to the discussion of the fourth.

Those persons whom we have called unenlightened may be divided into three classes. First, those barbarous nations who are not only ignorant of Christianity, but who are also deficient in civilization: such are the Hottentots of South Africa, the West Indian Negroes, the American Indians, and the inhabitants of the South Sea Islands. The second class comprehends those nations who are civilized, but who are unacquainted with the Christian religion: such are the Chinese, the natives of Hindostan, and some other Pagan and Mahometan nations. The third class includes those who call themselves Christians, but who are sunk in ignorance, or in superstition, and are strangers to genuine religion: such is the mass of the population in most Roman Catholic countries, such are the peasants of Ireland, and such are the inhabitants of some Protestant districts in our own country. Whatever shades of difference may exist among these different classes, yet, in reference to religion, there are certain features common to them all. We shall consider their intellectual, literary, religious, and social character; from which it will appear, that the best mode of imparting to them religious instruction is by preaching.

1. Their *intellectual* character. The first trait in the intellectual character of unenlightened nations is, that they are contented with their ignorance; they love to have it so. When ignorant men have become enlightened, it has been in consequence of intercourse with other nations, whose civilization first gave a stimulus to their own. There is no instance that we know of in which civilization rose up spon-

taneously in any nation; it has always been imported from abroad; it has always been derived from intercourse with more polished nations. With ignorance are generally associated conceit and obstinacy. After you have got an ignorant man to comprehend your meaning, you cannot easily persuade him to adopt your sentiments: an instructed man must yield to reason; an ignorant man will contend for the greatest absurdities.

Unenlightened men are subject to the influence of external objects. Their pleasures are derived from the gratification of the appetites, or from those engagements which excite a commotion in the animal system. They have no idea of furnishing the mind with pleasure by the operation of its own faculties. We trace the influence of this principle in the formation of all languages. The primitive words refer to sensible objects: as society becomes more improved, these words are applied to denote qualities which refer to the mind. The Roman Catholic religion is indebted to the splendour of its services for the success which it has had in spreading Christianity among barbarous nations. A religion which proscribes the exercise of the intellect, and is not rigid in regard to morals, may easily captivate, by pompous ceremonies, the mind of an untutored peasant.

Enlightened nations are governed by custom and authority. Something sacred is attached to antiquity: an idea of horror is excited by innovation. The Irish priests make appeals to this principle when they talk to their people of "the religion of their fathers."

When we consider the influence of these principles on the human mind, we immediately see the superiority of preaching as a means of religious instruction. Can we suppose that men, contented with ignorance, will take the trouble to read and to examine? that men, subject to the influence of external objects, will, at the sight of a book, directly have recourse to abstract reflection? or that by private study alone they will be led to renounce those religious ideas which have been sanctioned by custom and authority? No; we must have recourse to preaching. No means will be successful if unattended by this.

2. This will be more evident if we examine their *literary* character.

Unenlightened nations cannot read. This is obviously the case with all barbarians, and even with the bulk of the people in nations comparatively civilized: this was the case in our own country some years ago. Among all nations the reading part of the population has been but few. In ancient times this was occasioned by the high price of manuscripts. In barbarous lands it may be produced by an inability to manufacture suitable materials. But we find that men who have to labour for their subsistence, and who are accustomed to confine their attention to surrounding objects, are apt to treat with indifference, and even with contempt, those who are engaged in the pursuits of literature. When schools were first opened for the instruction of the poor, it was necessary to persuade parents to send their children. And even now it is the young chiefly who receive instruction.

Pagan and Popish nations have not the same reasons for instructing their children which Protestant nations have. The most powerful argument advanced by the friends of universal education was, that children would be able to read the Bible. This would have been no reason at all to the mind of a Papist; it would rather have induced him to oppose education. As both Popery and Paganism are opposed to the exercise of the intellect in matters of religion, they have fewer motives to induce their followers to promote the exercise of the intellect. Hence it will appear that to send books to unenlightened nations, and tell them to read, must be a very inefficient mode of instruction, and very far inferior to preaching.

3. View their *religious* character.

All ignorant nations are indifferent to the claims of religion. The things of this world are the chief objects of regard. They have no idea of a religion that has its seat in the heart. The chief motive to duty arises from present interests. The virtues of humanity are neglected; the dark places of the earth are full of the habitations of cruelty.

Indifferent as such people are to spiritual and rational religion, they are nevertheless exceedingly superstitious.

The idea of a superior power cannot be erased from the mind of man. The operations of nature around him inspire him with terror. And when he has no distinct revelation of the Great First Cause, he has recourse to conjecture. How silly are all the systems of heathen mythology! What ridiculous stories are related respecting the Pagan deities and the Popish saints! What absurd doctrines are broached! What foolish ceremonies are observed! Even in our own country how superstitious are those who are uninstructed! How many believe in witches and apparitions! What attention is paid to good and ill omens! How often do we hear of lucky and unlucky days!

As a necessary consequence of this, all unenlightened nations are priest-ridden. Wherever men are found who have folly enough to bend their necks to the yoke of superstition, there we shall be sure to find other men who will have wickedness enough to avail themselves of this circumstance, to promote their own advantage. Hence, in all dark parts of the earth we find persons who are considered as the ministers of religion, and who profess to drive away spirits, to exorcise devils, to cure diseases, and to appease the vengeance of the Deity. These persons soon improve their art into a trade, and increase their wealth by terrifying the multitude. It is now their interest to maintain that system of falsehood by which they are so well provided for; and hence in all ages priests have been the greatest enemies of improvement. What, then, can rouse men who are indifferent to vital religion? What can raise those who are sunk in the grossest superstition? How shall we contend against a subtle and interested priesthood? Can we expect success from any other means than from preaching?

4. View their *social* character.

Men are social beings. Their dispositions, no less than their mutual dependence, induce them to associate together. Among unenlightened men, the principal purposes for which they assemble are those of amusement and of religion. Though the savage is accustomed to solitude, he does not consider that as the season of enjoyment: it is the public

dance, or the general festival, which he anticipates with the greatest pleasure. Assemblies for the purpose of religion seem to be so natural to man, that almost every system of superstition has increased, to a very injurious degree, the number of holydays, or days appointed for religious festivals. By preaching we avail ourselves of this disposition of the untutored man. We do not give him a book, and tell him to retire into solitude and read; we invite him to meet his friends, to bring his acquaintances, to join a large assembly, and to acquire knowledge, in a way that not only improves the intellect, but also gratifies his taste. It is true we refer to the book we place in his hand; we regard that as the standard of our doctrine; but it is equally true that he will prize it more highly, and understand it more clearly, when accompanied by the instructions of the Christian ministry. The history of religious controversy in every country has shown us how necessary it is to have evangelical ministers well qualified to defend the Bible against those attacks to which it may be exposed, either from misguided superstition or from interested priestcraft.

We now close the series of essays which we have styled 'The Preacher.' On reviewing our labours, we find the following topics have been discussed:—1. The Object of Preaching.—2. The Effects of Preaching.—3. Apostolical Preaching.—4. Textual Preaching.—5. On Reading Sermons.—6. The Pulpit, the Bar, and the Senate.—7. Female Preachers.—8, 9, 10, and 11. The Superiority of Preaching, as a means of imparting religious instruction to Pagan, Popish, and other unenlightened nations.

The last four essays, though having a reference to the same general proposition, have separately discussed the following subjects:—Preaching has been considered—1. As sanctioned by Divine authority. 2. As the most efficient means of exhibiting the truths of religion. 3. As the most effectual means of inducing the human mind to embrace a system of truth; and 4. As best adapted to the actual condition of unenlightened nations.

THE PLATFORM.

I.—COMPARISON BETWEEN THE PULPIT AND THE PLATFORM.

We have observed in 'The Preacher,' that the Christian Church has arrived at an era which may be called the era of benevolence. Religious and charitable societies of all descriptions have been formed, and an appeal from the Platform has been one of the principal means of promoting the object of their institution. There is generally a great convenience, and often a peculiar propriety, in holding our public meetings in places of religious worship. By assembling there, we have sufficient and suitable accommodation. There is no pecuniary drawback on our contributions to pay the expense of the meeting, and we are called upon to exercise the duties of benevolence in the very place where we have so often heard them inculcated.

In this essay we shall notice some points of comparison between the Pulpit and the Platform.

I. In the Pulpit we have only one speaker; on the Platform we have many.

No one individual, however exalted, possesses the wisdom of a number. Our Creator has thought proper to divide his munificence, and bestow distinct portions of intellectual eminence on different persons. No one man excels in everything; most in something: in the multitude of counsellors is wisdom. The Platform collects these scattered rays of excellence, and pours their united force on the subject in-

tended to be illumined. The same subject thus considered by different individuals, of a different genius, different degrees of learning, and different habits of study, will necessarily receive a fuller and better discussion than if it had been discussed by one person. A degree of emulation, too, may be supposed to exist amongst these gentlemen, which will give an additional degree of energy to the exercise of their intellectual faculties. At all events, the perpetual succession of speakers tends to enliven attention, and to banish that indifference to which we are so much disposed, when listening to a long discourse from a single speaker.

II. In the Pulpit the speaker is a minister; on the Platform we include laymen.

"Who," exclaims the deist, "are advocates for Christianity? Are they not fine portly gentlemen, who are interested in the truths they profess to teach? Is it not natural enough they should defend the system by which they are so comfortably supported?" These insinuations are unfair in argument and despicable in morals. In pleading for the truths of revelation, ministers do not ground the evidence on their personal character, but on the reasons they advance. The practitioners of law and medicine, the teachers of music and mathematics, are all supported by their profession; but who ever supposed that on this account these sciences rested on a less certain basis? Yet suggestions of this nature produce an impression on weak minds. It appears natural to question the reasoning of an interested advocate. The vicious and the mercenary, who, judging by themselves, resolve all principles of action into self-interest, seize with avidity every opportunity of depreciating the ministers of a religion by which their own practice is so strongly condemned.

But to these objections the platform furnishes an answer, which, if not more satisfactory in itself, is more likely to silence our opponents. No, we reply, the defenders of Christianity are not interested advocates. Look at our platforms: there you behold statesmen and philosophers, merchants and artists, men of all ranks and of all classes, united in incul-

cating the truths of our holy religion; there behold the advocates, there behold the influence of Christianity. What general bond of interest could unite together individuals of various orders and of different pursuits? What sordid motives could induce men of rank and wealth to descend from their greatness to a public platform, to plead the cause of ignorance and misery? What could induce princes to issue from their palaces to urge the claims of the sons of humble poverty? Where but in a Christian country can you witness such a scene as this? These are the triumphs of Christianity. It is in scenes like these that greatness gathers her sweetest and softest laurels—laurels which will give composure to the head that wears them, and which will maintain their freshness when the blood-stained garland of the conqueror shall have faded into insignificance, and be viewed only with abhorrence.

III. In the Pulpit the speaker is a sectarian—on the Platform all sectarian principles are excluded. We use the word sectarian in no disrespectful sense. In the Pulpit it is the duty of a minister to declare the whole counsel of God, and to contend strongly for the points both of doctrine and of discipline which he has conscientiously adopted, and which are inculcated by that religious community with which the dictates of his judgment have induced him to associate. But in all our creeds are these not points of minor importance? Is not a degree of indifference to these on particular occasions perfectly reconcilable with inflexibility of principle and consistency of character? On the Platform these minor distinctions, though not renounced, are not brought forward. One spirit pervades the assembly. The names which denote the different sects are forgotten, and each individual is ambitious only of the name of Christian. Every Pulpit bears the complexion of a party; but on the Platform these shades of difference are united, and their union, like that of the colours in philosophy, renders each imperceptible; and the mind, dazzled and delighted, can see nothing but the splendours of benevolence.

IV. In the Pulpit the range of discussion is restricted; on

the Platform it is more extended. The ordinary business of a religious association will necessarily introduce many subjects which would ill correspond with the sanctity of the Pulpit. Hence, though all that is sacred in Pulpit discussion may be introduced on the Platform, its range of subjects is still more extensive. Matters of finance—humorous anecdotes—metaphorical allusions, and affairs of ordinary life, are often introduced, not only with propriety, but with considerable effect. This circumstance is of great advantage to the speakers. Individuals who are neither qualified nor desirous of entering into theological discussion, are enabled to select topics congenial with their talents or pursuits, and thus furnish the assembly with useful information on subjects not, perhaps, in themselves strictly religious, but which are closely connected with the interest of a religious society, and which tend to the accomplishment of the objects for which it is instituted.

V. In the Pulpit we have only the sentiments of a single person; on the Platform the audience express their concurrence. In former ages public assemblies expressed their approbation by loud applause, even at the instructions of the Pulpit. This custom is now very properly laid aside: the solemnities of the Pulpit, and the sanctity of the Sabbath, in order to procure their proper effect, seem to require a state of mind which is not strictly compatible, at least on all occasions, with those tumultuous expressions of applause which take place at our public meetings. On the Platform, however, these are attended with peculiar advantages. They awaken and perpetuate attention. They excite and interest the feelings. They stimulate the speakers to make their most powerful efforts. They prevent that weariness which a protracted discussion is likely to produce. They afford a standard by which public men are able to judge of the station they occupy in general estimation, and of the effect which their talents are adapted to produce on a popular assembly. And to an intelligent observer these applauses present a very good criterion of the public taste. In proportion as the speakers applauded are distinguished by real merit, in pro-

portion as their prevailing quality is argument, metaphor, eloquence, or learning, in such proportion will his estimation be formed respecting the intellectual character of the people.

VI. We approach the Pulpit to procure personal benefit; we surround the Platform to promote the happiness of others.

There is scarcely any virtue which calls forth more promptly the approbation of our hearts and of our lips than disinterestedness. Hence, in every age, patriotism and philanthropy have received universal homage. Poetry has sung their praise, philosophy has wept over their fall, and sculpture has perpetuated their memory. This principle, it is true, is inculcated in the Pulpit, but on the Platform it is exhibited. The Pulpit and the Platform are not opposed to each other. There is no inconsistency between them. They bear the same relation to each other as cause and effect. The good seeds scattered from the Pulpit, nurtured by the labours of the faithful minister, and watered with the dews of heavenly grace, vegetate, and, gradually rising, bend over the Platform, and create a lovely bower—the bower of benevolence. Bigotry and Superstition fly from this delightful scene. To revel here, Opulence renounces the pleasures of luxury. Hither Beauty comes to bind her tresses with a garland of its vernal green, and to adorn her bosom with its blushing flowers. Here Business, after bustling through the day amid scenes of active life, comes at the close, to regale his spirits with its delightful fragrance. Friendship here wanders amid her smiling votaries, and draws more closely her silken bands. The melodious sounds of Eloquence break on the ear, and alternately melt into tenderness, or swell into rapture. Religion descending from the clouds, stands in the midst, and breathes her blessing. With her left hand she bestows ecstatic pleasures, and with her right points to an immortal crown. At her approach the flowers of Benevolence assume a lovelier hue, and diffuse a sweeter smell. Their cheering fragrance, borne on the wings of heaven, is wafted to every part of the earth, and, more powerful than all the spices of Arabia, they revive the hopes, and relieve the miseries of a drooping world.

II.—THE INFLUENCE OF THE PLATFORM.

We now propose to trace the influence of the Platform on the state of society. It must be obvious, from the tenor of our last essay, that it is the *religious* Platform to which we intend to direct attention. This, from the superior importance of its object, has the strongest claim on our regard. It was the success of the Platform in awakening the moral and benevolent feelings of the public, that led to its more extensive adoption as a means of promoting the interest of other laudable objects.

The general influence produced on society by our religious and charitable institutions is a subject of ordinary discussion. We shall therefore describe those effects only which result from our public meetings. To the Platform may be ascribed the following beneficial tendencies :—

1. It promotes the circulation of useful knowledge.

At the commencement of a public meeting, the chairman, after a short address, requests the secretary to read the report of the committee respecting the proceedings of the previous year. This report, when not injudiciously compiled, nor extended to a wearisome length, is generally an interesting document. It presents a collection of facts and observations designed to show the necessity and utility of the association, and details the progress which has been made in accomplishing the objects for which it has been instituted. These facts have been supplied from personal inspection, by the disinterested labours of the several agents of the Society. A report, therefore, embodies a mass of authentic information, gathered from various sources, comprising details, statistical, moral, and religious, and adapted to interest the feelings of the patriot, the philanthropist, and the divine.

The different speakers succeed, and move and second the proposed resolutions. By commenting on the report, they impress it more deeply on the mind, and they corroborate its statements by their own experience. Thus additional infor-

mation, communicated by respectable individuals engaged in different pursuits, and occupying different spheres of observation, is communicated in a public assembly, where it reaches the ears of many persons to whom it would never find access in a printed form; and its impression is considerably increased by being associated with the weight of character, the force of talent, and the charms of eloquence.

It is easy to adduce particular instances in illustration of these remarks. How much has our knowledge been increased with regard to the condition of the lower classes of society! Who could have imagined there was such an utter destitution of the Holy Scriptures, were it not authenticated by the district agents of the Bible Society? Who could have supposed that so large a portion of the community were unable to read, were we not assured of the fact by the labours of our school societies? How comparatively little should we know of the deplorable superstition of Ireland, or of the abominations of heathen lands, were it not for the exertions of those societies which have for their objects the evangelization of the sister country, and the extension of Christianity throughout the world!

2. It strengthens the bonds of union between the respective ranks of society.

The existence of different orders in the constitution of human society is one of those wise arrangements by which Providence has united mankind more closely to each other. These ranks, however, are too much disposed to behold each other with feelings of aversion; the poor envy the rich, the rich despise the poor. It is natural to man to make himself the standard by which he forms his judgment of others. And hence the diversity of ranks, instead of being viewed as a wise expedient for promoting the happiness of the whole, too often excites in our minds sentiments either too humble or too elevated, according to the point of view from which they are surveyed. When we stand at the foot of a lofty mountain which strikes deep into the earth, and seems to rest its basis on the centre of the globe, and which, rising in rugged majesty, rears its aspiring head into the clouds, and is capped

with eternal snows, we shrink at our own insignificance, and are astonished at the grandeur of nature. And when we climb the eminence, and look down into the valleys beneath our feet, and behold the distant objects dwindling from our view, we entertain lofty notions of the station we occupy, and become giddy with our own elevation. But when the philosopher comes to explain the constitution of nature, he attaches no importance to mountains and to valleys. He tells us that the world is round, and that the inequalities on its surface are in their relative importance no more than grains of dust on a common geographical globe. Just so it is in human life. We look above us, and we are awed; we look beneath us, and we are proud. But under the tuition of Divine philosophy, we learn that the distinctions of rank and wealth, however useful they may be to our present mode of existence, are trifles unworthy of our notice compared with the true grandeur and dignity of man. The Platform has a tendency to strengthen these sentiments. A religious institution is associated with the three classes of the community—the poor, whom it is designed to relieve; the middle classes, who constitute the majority of its members; and the wealthy, by whom it is patronised and encouraged. The union of the two latter classes in projecting schemes of benevolence, necessarily tends to increase their regard for each other, and the former class are bound to these by the ties of gratitude. On our Platform the nobles of the land are introduced more frequently to public notice, under circumstances which occasion a sympathy of feeling. Nothing tends so much to produce sentiments of mutual regard as frequent intercourse. We may respect those whom we have never seen, but some degree of acquaintance is essential to personal attachment. The language of condescension and benevolence from a man of rank has a wonderful influence in winning the hearts of the people; and he, in return, gratified with the applauses of his fellow-countrymen, feels a stronger interest in their welfare and prosperity. Thus the union of ranks so essential to national greatness, and which was designed to be promoted at Sparta by public meals, and at

Rome by the institution of patrons and clients, is secured to our country by means of the Platform.

3. It cherishes the exercise of Christian charity between different religious sects.

When the question is proposed to us, Why does the Divine Being permit his Church to be divided into sects and parties? it is not sufficient to answer, that our faith is founded on ancient writings, the meaning of which, in the course of time, must necessarily become partially obscured, from the alteration of manners and the fluctuation of language; that hence there are different readings and interpretations not only of the classic authors, but even of the earlier English writers; and therefore it is no wonder that different opinions are entertained respecting the meaning of some passages in a book translated many years ago from foreign languages, and those languages no longer spoken; it is not sufficient to tell us, that all other religions as well as Christianity, and even Deism itself, have been divided into sects arising from difference of sentiment; it is not sufficient to say there are controverted opinions in all the branches of human study, and that theology, like other sciences, will necessarily be subject to those inconveniences which result from the imperfection of our knowledge;—all this is true, but it is not a sufficient answer to the question. The Divine Being might have unfolded his will in a manner that should have precluded all doubt, and He could have rendered the doctrines of his word as clear as its precepts: why has He not? As an intelligent being, He must be influenced by motives; and we do well in endeavouring to discover the reasons of the divine procedure. By investigation it will appear, that the existence of religious sects is beneficial to the cause of religion. Greater attention is paid to the sacred volume. If established truths are viewed with indifference; if curiosity be more keenly excited by the obscurity of its object; if the gradual acquisition of knowledge by our own exertions be more grateful than its splendid and universal disclosure; if the human mind acts with more energy by being opposed; and if controversy tends to invigorate the combatants, and to

interest the curious and the indifferent, then does the existence of sects produce greater attention to the sacred Scriptures. It is also beneficial to morality. All the different parties, by watching over each other, endeavour to trace in their conduct the influence of their principles. Hence each sect, anxious for its own reputation, rigorously enforces on all its members the performance of moral duties. By this means, too, religion is adapted to the diversified character of man. As individuals are, by their natural disposition, inclined to particular vices, so are they biassed in favour of particular principles of religion; and Christianity being proposed in a variety of forms, they are induced to embrace that system of doctrines which is most congenial with their natural temperament. Even literature and liberty have been thus promoted. What researches have been made into ancient history and ancient manners, how critically have the original languages been investigated, how many departments of science have been explored, in order to establish the controverted truths of Christianity! And what masterly defences of the rights of conscience, of civil liberty, and of freedom of discussion, have been written by men writhing under the lash of persecution!

But not the least advantage arising from these divisions in the Christian world is, that Christians have by this means the opportunity of indulging in the exercise of mutual charity. This duty, alas! was sadly neglected by our fathers. And although the authority of the civil power had arrested the hand of persecution, yet the respective parties still beheld each other with coldness and dislike. Some means were wanting which, by uniting them in the same grand design, and bringing them into familiar intercourse, should soften their mutual asperities. These means were supplied by the Platform. The formation of the Bible Society was the signal of union. Here the contending parties stood side by side, and fought in a common cause. When the champions of the different sects beheld each other, they gazed with wonder, and were surprised to find that their former antagonists were beings so different from what their previous

imaginations had conceived. Here the Churchman was instructed and delighted by the learning and the eloquence of those Dissenters whose names he had been taught to consider as synonymous with ignorance and vulgarity. Here the Dissenter, who had always regarded the dignitary of the Church as the apostle of persecution, listened with pleasure to the accents of celestial mildness gently falling from the lips of Episcopalianism. Thus, their mutual prejudice being removed, Christian charity united them in her holy bonds, and, teaching them to forget their violent antipathies, she combined their efforts against the general foe.

4. It tends to the improvement of eloquence.

When the utility of general education was a subject of controversy, it was stated by its advocates, as one argument in its favour, that the education of the lower classes would cause a greater degree of attention to be paid to the education of the middle and higher classes, in order that they might still maintain their intellectual superiority. This prediction has been verified. A knowledge of the art of public speaking is one of those additional acquisitions which are anxiously desired even by those who are engaged in the active pursuits of life. For the attainment of this object, the formation of our religious societies has presented astonishing facilities. The committees of these societies are preparatory schools of eloquence. Here all the measures of the society are discussed in friendly debate, and the subjects, being connected with actual business, are adapted to the character of the persons of whom the committees are chiefly composed. Eloquence is thus acquired by means the most natural and easy. The art of speaking, like that of swimming, can be acquired only by endeavouring to practise it. The debate of a committee is a medium between the familiarity of common conversation and the dignity of public discussion. Here the speakers utter their sentiments with freedom, and, by repeated exercise, they acquire that command of feeling and that affluence of language by which they are qualified to address larger assemblies. After this previous training, to make a speech on a platform is not an engagement so very appalling. The

speaker may prepare his address. His ideas will be supplied by the nature of the institution, or by his personal knowledge of its operations. His speech may be long or short, according to his inclination. He is associated with his equals in rank and in talent, and the audience encourage him with their applause.

Among the ancient Romans, all the youth of a liberal education studied rhetoric, though intended for even a military life. The Platform has tended to produce a similar effect, and to make the art of speaking, as it ought to be, the ordinary attainment of every individual who may even occasionally be called upon to sustain any public character. Not only has eloquence been thus more widely diffused, but it has been considerably improved. It has become more distinguished by pathos and by metaphor. When the object of a speaker is to stimulate to the exercise of compassion, he naturally makes bold and pathetic appeals to the feelings of his audience. Passion gives rise to metaphor; and as the mind gathers its comparisons from objects with which it is familiar, the introduction of various speakers moving in different spheres of society will necessarily produce a greater variety of metaphorical allusions. Were a collection to be made of all the new and beautiful figures of speech exhibited on the platform during the last twenty years, it would compose an offering worthy of being laid on the altar of the Muses. Even the Pulpit has been improved by the Platform. That apathy for which our ministers were formerly censured has gradually given place to a style of composition and of delivery that breathes the soul of genuine eloquence.

5. It most powerfully excites the feelings of compassion.

No duty is more frequently enjoined in the Holy Scriptures than that of benevolence. The poor man was particularly regarded in the Mosaic law. He might enter any field or vineyard, and take enough to satisfy his hunger. If a sheaf were left behind, it was not to be fetched, and the vines were not to be too carefully gleaned. No interest could be charged on money which he had borrowed. And if untoward circumstances compelled him to sell his patrimony and his liberty,

both were restored to him at the year of jubilee. In addition to this, the religious services of the sanctuary pronounced every blessing on the head of him who had mercy on the poor.

Christianity enforced and extended this principle. Not only does she require the exercise of charity towards our neighbours, or those who are members of the same community, but even in regard to our national or personal foes—"*If thy enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink.*"

When Popery extended her baneful influence over Europe, charity, like everything else, was misapplied. Christian benevolence was supposed to consist in supporting monasteries, in which Superstition held her court, and Idleness lounged at ease; and where, too often, Sensuality performed her orgies, Persecution forged her chains, and Treason planned her crimes.

The benevolence inculcated on the Platform is more pure, more judicious, and more extensive. It exhibits the finest feelings of human nature, blended with the graces of religion. It embraces not merely the corporeal distresses of its objects, but also provides for them moral and intellectual supplies. It is not governed by the suggestions of fanaticism or of superstition, but it is regulated by the instructions of the sacred volume. It confines not its benefits to the perishable things of time, but is associated with the glories of immortality.

That the Platform has a great influence in exciting and extending these feelings appears from two circumstances. The first is the practice of procuring support to every new institution, by calling a public meeting, and advocating its claims from the Platform. The second is the constant increase of charitable associations. It was anticipated that, by repeated applications in behalf of these societies, the public feeling would become callous. But the reverse has been the fact. Not only have the old societies gone forward with increasing strength, but numerous ramifications have shot forth, all exhibiting the same lovely appearance, and equally pregnant with substantial fruit. Thus the tree of

Christian benevolence has flourished in our land—"The tree grew and was strong, and the height thereof reached unto heaven, and the sight thereof to the end of all the earth; the leaves thereof were fair, and the fruit thereof much, and in it was meat for all; the beasts of the field had shadow under it, and the fowls of heaven dwelt in the boughs thereof, and all flesh was fed of it."

III.—THE IMPERFECTIONS OF THE PLATFORM.

"Am I, therefore, become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?" was the language of St. Paul to the Galatians. There are many cases in which an exposition of the faults either of an individual or an institution ought rather to be considered as a mark of the strongest attachment than as an indication of hostility. If imperfections are not pointed out, they will never be corrected; and if they are not corrected, the character will not be improved. "Let the righteous smite me," said the Psalmist; "it shall be a kindness: and let him *reprove* me; it shall be an excellent oil, which shall not break my head." "He that refuseth instruction," says Solomon, "despiseth his own soul; but he that heareth *reproof*, getteth understanding."

Nor ought the exposure of imperfections, in regard to public institutions, to be considered as betraying a wish to deny or depreciate the existence of the many excellences with which such institutions are connected. In proportion as they approach perfection, in such proportion must we regret those minor blemishes by which their glories are partially obscured. It is, indeed, the excellence of these institutions which, by rendering their faults more apparent, makes them more liable to public observation. The spots of the sun have been inspected more minutely than though they had occurred on a less splendid luminary.

It is under the impression of feelings similar to these, it is with the highest conviction of its excellence, and the warmest attachment to its operations, that we proceed to

point out the imperfections of the Platform. This is only a human institution, and therefore we are guilty of no inconsistency, if we suppose it partakes in some degree of that imperfection by which everything human is distinguished. It is also in the infancy of its existence, and we may therefore suppose that it has not yet attained that full expansion of its power which will characterize the maturity of its growth. The chief imperfections which have fallen under our observation are the following:

1. Making apologies.

We can rarely attend a public meeting without hearing several apologies. Some apologize for associating with those who belong to a different religious communion; others make laboured efforts to prove that the society whose cause they advocate is not inconsistent with the principles of their own sect; but most generally the apology is intended to account for the badness of the speech. One of the most common reasons assigned is a want of ability—no doubt a very satisfactory one. But why could not the hearers themselves be allowed to make this important discovery? Did the speaker apprehend that his incompetency would not be sufficiently obvious? or was he afraid that the dulness or the candour of his audience might cause it to be overlooked? Here is a singular paradox in human conduct. There is scarcely any charge that a man would repel with so much indignation as a want of intellect, and yet there is nothing which he will so readily ascribe to himself. None acknowledge a want of compassion, a want of zeal, or a want of activity; but all are eager to acknowledge a want of ability. How shall we account for this? Must we not suppose that he does not believe himself to be thus deficient, but that the cloak of humility is only assumed?

Speakers very often inform the audience that they had no idea of speaking till they entered the room. This may be true, and yet the speech may have been previously composed. But, if not, it is no such mighty thing for a man to deliver a short address without previous meditation: our barristers are continually in the habit of doing so. But of all

men, this excuse comes with the worst grace from the ministers of religion. What is more astonishing than that men who have for years been accustomed to address the public two or three times a week for an hour together should think it necessary to make an apology when called upon to speak for ten minutes without previous study, and that, too, upon a topic closely connected with the subjects of their ordinary administration? These apologies have given rise to several common and inelegant phrases, which may be called the cant of the Platform. How often does a speaker talk of his "very humble abilities?" how many times does he tell us, that his speech is only a "foil," to set off the superior merits of his companions? and with what artlessness does he speak of "the motion which has been put into his hand!" Where would he have it put but into his hand? would he have it thrust into his mouth?

> "The modest speaker is ashamed and grieved
> To engross a moment's notice, and yet begs,
> Begs a propitious ear for his poor thoughts,
> However trivial all that he conceives.
> Sweet bashfulness! it claims at least this praise,
> The dearth of information and good sense
> That it foretels us, always comes to pass."
>
> COWPER.

It would be well if all apologies were banished from our Platforms. They certainly have no influence in conciliating the favour of the sensible part of the audience. If a man really thinks himself so incompetent, why has he the effrontery to engage? Why does he not retire, and let his place be supplied by others more able to perform the duty? But he does not think so. All apologies spring from pride. When reduced to plain English, they amount to this—"I can speak better than I am going to speak. Let me beg of you not to take the present address as any criterion of my abilities. I assure you I am a much wiser and a much cleverer man than you would suppose me to be, were you to judge of my talents by the speech I am about to deliver."

2. Reading extracts from books or letters.

If a speaker wished to become tedious, he could not possibly devise a more suitable way than this. Reading from the Pulpit is irksome enough, but on the Platform it is insufferable. If a person has a letter from an agent of the society moving in a distant sphere of operation, it is much better that he hold the letter in his hand, and relate the substance of it in his own language. A speaker in a public meeting is not like a pleader in a court of equity, who must produce all the original documents in order to establish his case. If, however, the letter must be read, it ought to be read well. As few people write a plain hand, it is exceedingly difficult to read fluently the writing of another. To overcome this difficulty, the letter should be read aloud five or six times before it is read in public. By this means the reader will be enabled to avoid those mistakes and hesitations which alone would be sufficient to counteract any good effect which the letter in itself might be calculated to produce; but on no occasion should a *long* letter be read. It would assuredly become tiresome; and the only pleasure it will afford to the hearers will be derived from its conclusion.

3. Adopting a preaching style of address.

A speech is different from a sermon. In a sermon it is requisite to state the divisions of the discourse. It is necessary to announce the topics to be discussed, and the order in which they are to be treated. But this would be fatal to a speech. By inducing the assembly to expect a long discourse, it would inevitably diminish their attention. Nor are all topics proper for discussion in our public meetings. It is true our institutions are religious institutions. It is true our public meetings are meetings for the promotion of religion. It is true the subjects here introduced must be religious subjects, and yet it is equally true that there is a variety of religious subjects which are well adapted for discussion in the Pulpit, and which are not adapted for the Platform. Of this description we may enumerate formal discussions of religious doctrines, criticisms on particular passages of Scripture, solemn appeals on the value of the soul, and fervent exhortations to the *general* practice of

Christian virtues. Every public address should be adapted to promote the end in view. Now, the objects of the Pulpit and of the Platform, though not inconsistent with each other, are widely different; or rather the Platform has for its *chief* object what constitutes but one of the subordinate objects of the Pulpit. The chief object of the Platform is to excite a *spirit of liberality*, in reference to that *particular institution* which has been the occasion of the meeting. Hence it is evident that a subject which shall refer merely to religion in general, or even to benevolence in general, is not adapted for this particular occasion. Some who have written on the art of preaching have stated, that a sermon should be so interwoven in its construction with the text to which it is attached, that the same sermon could not be preached from any other text: a similar rule may be applied to the Platform. A speech ought to be so well adapted to the institution in favour of which it is spoken, that it could not be delivered in behalf of any other institution. Nay, we may go farther:—it ought also to be so closely associated with the circumstances of time and place, that it could not be spoken in favour of even the same institution on any preceding or subsequent meeting. The *manner* of discussing a subject on the Platform also requires attention. That mode of address which is best adapted to excite the feelings of compassion ought most to be cultivated. Hence we should appeal to the imagination and to the passions rather than to the intellect. The applauses of the assembly are perhaps a proper guide on this subject. When people express their emotions without restraint, we may conclude that the loudest acclamations arise from the strongest feelings. By attending to this criterion we shall find, that close or protracted reasonings, however excellent, when delivered from the Pulpit, produce but little effect from the Platform. In a genteel assembly, nothing strikes so forcibly as those ideas which are new and beautiful. Ingenious allusions and elegant metaphors never fail to produce a happy effect. Noble and manly sentiments are sure to be approved. Effusions of humour are always agreeable. They prevent indifference, increase attention, and tend to produce

an openness of heart which is exceedingly friendly to the exercise of charity.

4. Making injudicious allusions to different religious sects.

When a society is avowedly conducted upon the principles of a particular denomination, a vindication of those principles from the Platform is by no means improper. Thus, for instance, no one could take offence if, at a public meeting of the *Baptist* Missionary Society, a speaker should defend the practice of immersion. But when a society is conducted on general principles; when, like the Bible Society, it includes members of all religious sects; and when the speakers belong to different denominations, it is improper and indecent to employ language which may excite angry feelings in the minds of those who belong to a different sect. The speaker stands there, not as a sectarian, but as a Christian. It is his duty to advocate the interests of the society, not to offend its members. The Platform should be the seat of concord, and shame to the man who endeavours to make it the arena of contention! Yet this is not a very rare occurrence. Reverend clergymen are guilty of this offence when, almost as soon as their names are announced, fearing to be confounded with the common herd of reverends, with which they happen for the moment to be associated, they break forth in lofty strains in praise of the ecclesiastical establishment to which they inform the assembly they have the *honour* to belong. Dissenters, too, violate this rule when, from a desire to exalt the zeal and activity of their own body, they censure somewhat too harshly the apathy of the prelates and members of the Established Church. An assumption of superiority, however modestly expressed, cannot fail to be offensive to those who belong to a different communion.

5. Making captious or sarcastic remarks on what has fallen from preceding speakers.

When a speaker has had the imprudence to attack any body of Christians, he can have no reason to complain if a subsequent speaker should reply to his remarks. It is also very proper to correct any mistakes into which preceding speakers may have fallen in regard to matters of fact. But

nothing is more liable to produce a dislike towards any man than to see him betray a disposition to quarrel with those who have gone before him. It is exceedingly unpleasant to those who are censured. Young speakers, who have prepared their speeches with the greatest care, are discouraged, and the interest they feel in the society is diminished, when they hear their speeches subjected to the cavils of criticism, when all their sentiments are canvassed, when the worst construction is put on their language, and they are made offenders for a word. Difference of opinion on minor points may with propriety be stated on the Platform; but never in a manner to excite anger or resentment. This is one of those cases in which the manner is often more important than the matter.

6. Alluding to questions of party politics.

Politics and religion are by no means opposed to each other. The most devout Christians have been the greatest patriots. Nor is it desirable that politics should be altogether excluded from the Platform. As a means of exciting the gratitude and the zeal of the audience, it is very proper to refer to the splendid political privileges we enjoy, the numerous national blessings we have received, and the great facilities which are presented, by our commercial engagements, for the extension of religion throughout the world. But questions of *party* politics, those points by which the different political parties are distinguished, should always be excluded. The justice or policy of prosecutions for blasphemy, and the propriety of granting what has been termed Catholic emancipation, are questions * upon which the wisest and the most pious men entertain different sentiments. Why, then, should a public speaker introduce these topics at so unseasonable a time; at a time when it should be his object, instead of rousing political antipathies, to soothe his hearers to the exercise of compassion?

7. Paying excessive compliments to the female part of the audience.

* These were the questions that occupied public attention at the time the above was written.

The man who first suggested the idea of employing female agency in the cause of our religious associations, deserves to have his memory perpetuated in the Christian Church by a statue more splendid than that which was erected in the plains of Dura. It is undeniable that the success with which these institutions have been attended is owing, in a great degree, to the patronage of the female part of the community. No wonder, therefore, that the platform should proclaim their praise. But should there not be bounds to this practice? Is it not getting too common? The custom of complimenting the ladies is no longer confined to the young, the amorous, and the gay. On these public occasions, even grave and reverend divines will descend from the lofty heights of theology, and wander with inexpressible complacency among the flowery meads of compliment, in order to gather nosegays for the ladies. It may be said, indeed, that this is good policy; that the ladies are fond of flattery; and that we shall secure their future patronage by sacrificing liberally at the altar of their vanity. It is hoped that our British ladies patronize these religious and benevolent institutions from nobler principles. But, supposing it were otherwise, supposing that sound policy required us to offer the incense of flattery, still it must be recollected that this should be done wisely. Flattery, in its native grossness, cannot be acceptable to even a female mind; it must be refined by politeness, and modelled by ingenuity, before it becomes an ornament that Beauty will suffer to grace her bosom, or Vanity permit to dangle in her ear. It is not desirable, nor would it be consistent with the claims of gratitude, to banish from our Platforms all eulogium on the female character. But, to give these eulogiums their full effect, the following rules should be observed:—In the first place, they should not be too common. It is no mark of ability in a speaker to produce every-day compliments, picked up from ordinary conversation, or gleaned from poetic works with which every one is acquainted; Secondly, they should not be too long. A lengthened panegyric always conveys the idea of previous study, and studied compliments are always received with

disgust. Thirdly, they should not be too amorous; they should correspond with the dignity of the occasion. Hence, in praising the ladies, we should refer to the fervency of their piety, the quickness of their sensibilities, the ardour of their zeal, the utility of their exertions, and not so much to those personal attractions which are likely to interest the feelings of a lover. "Oh! woman—lovely woman, angels are painted fair to look like you!" would come with a very ill grace from a religious Platform. Fourthly, they should be introduced by the occasion. At the meeting of a society instituted for the relief of females, or in moving a vote of thanks for the assistance which they may have rendered to the institution, the claims and excellences of the female character are proper topics of discussion. But to introduce this subject, when no suitable occasion is presented, is highly improper. There are seasons on the Platform, as well as in human life, in which the introduction even of females is considered an intrusion. Fifthly, they should not proceed from affectation. As attachment to the other sex is a universal passion, its avowal confers no distinction. The speaker who pronounces an eulogy on female character with a view of catching applause, who hopes that the attractions of the subject will supply the deficiencies of his genius, and hence enable him to enjoy an acclamation which otherwise he could not obtain, will generally find himself deceived. Sixthly, they should not be too frequent. When they become frequent, they will always be expected, and the result will be lost in the anticipation. The choicest dainties are treated with indifference when they become our ordinary diet. Under these regulations, the excellences of the female character may properly be eulogized on the Platform. This practice tends to excite the most agreeable associations, to produce a deeper interest in regard to the proceedings, and to encourage our female coadjutors to labour more abundantly in the work of benevolence.

8. Speaking too long.

A person who makes a long speech must either infringe on the time of the other speakers, or else prolong the meeting to an inconvenient hour. He will also often introduce subjects

but remotely connected with the object of the institution, and hence the attention of the audience will be diminished, and their feelings depressed. It is an error to suppose that long speeches denote either strength of intellect or fertility of genius. A dull discourse of an hour long is composed with greater facility than a good address which may be delivered in ten minutes; yet how frequently is our patience taxed by addresses of this description. We are tempted to imagine that the quantity was designed to atone for the quality. Those who speak in the early part of the meeting are most likely to fall into this error. The gentleman who moves the acceptance of the Report will often discuss all the points worthy of observation in the whole detail of the proceedings. This is an act of injustice towards the succeeding speakers, not only as it diminishes the time necessary for the delivery of their addresses, which probably they had previously prepared, but, also, as it is an endeavour to anticipate their arguments, or to weaken their effect. Some speakers eke out their address by delivering an *expository lecture* on the motion they propose. They do not seem to be aware that the motions are intended chiefly to introduce the speeches, that their language is so plain as to require no explication, and the sentiment so general as to exclude all difference of opinion. When the motion refers to persons connected with the society, it is very proper to notice the merits of those persons; but it can never be necessary to cut a motion into shreds, to consider it clause by clause, and to parcel it out into as many minute portions as a divine of the sixteenth century would divide a text of Scripture. But, of all long-winded speakers, none are so tedious as those who tell long stories. If an anecdote be intended to produce any effect on the audience, it is essentially necessary that it be related with brevity. Sometimes the gentleman in the chair is guilty of speaking too long, or rather of speaking too much. A speech at the commencement, stating the object of the meeting, and another at the close, will be sufficient for the chairman. It is by no means desirable that he should address the assembly every time he puts a motion. This practice is not only liable

to all the objections against long speeches in general, but it appears to cast a reflection on the speakers who had proposed and seconded the motion, as though they had failed in the discharge of their office.

9. Flattering the chairman.

Towards the conclusion of the meeting a vote of thanks is generally given to the chairman, who is sure to receive in great abundance the incense of adulation, especially if he be a man of rank. The advantages arising to the cause of religious benevolence from the patronage of the great are too obvious to be denied, and ought not to be concealed; but it cannot be pleasant to any individual to hear himself praised before a public assembly for qualities which he does not possess, and perhaps to hear others calumniated, in order that his own praise may be exalted. Even the custom of bowing to the chairman, at the commencement of a speech, is more becoming a public performer than the advocate of a religious institution. But if the chairman in these cases has more honour than his due, he is in other instances deprived of those tokens of respect to which he has an indubitable claim. Some speakers seem to forget there is any chairman in the room, and address their speech to the assembly at large, making use of the terms, "Ladies and gentlemen," and sometimes even of the pulpit phrase, "My brethren." This is very irregular. In all public meetings the chairman should be the *sole* person addressed. In our courts of law, indeed, we address the judge and jury, "May it please your lordship —Gentleman of the jury;" but in the House of Commons, which more nearly approaches the character of a popular assembly, every speech is supposed to be addressed to the president; and the other members, whether noticed individually or collectively, are always referred to in the third person. A speaker should not stand with his back towards the chair, but in such a position as to be able to direct his looks alternately toward the president and the assembly.

If so much respect is due from the speakers to the president, it is equally incumbent on the president to render due honour to the speakers. He ought to be the most attentive

hearer in the assembly. What opinion will the audience entertain of a chairman who, while he is addressed in strains of the most impassioned eloquence, is engaged in reading papers, in casting a vacant stare over the room, or in conversing with those around him? Will not a conduct like this have an injurious effect on the minds of the hearers? and will not the speaker relax his efforts when he finds he has lost the ear of the president? As the chairman is the organ of the meeting, he need not, when he puts a resolution, hold up his own hand in its support. He should not be anxious to call speakers to order, and, when under the necessity of doing so, it should be done in the mildest and most conciliating manner. A great portion of the effect of a public meeting depends upon an active and judicious chairman.

The imperfections of the Platform are such as may easily be corrected, and they form but trifling defects when compared with its immense excellences. It is unquestionably the most powerful instrument of doing good that has been discovered in modern times. It calls forth our activity in a manner the most agreeable to ourselves, and presents at once a field of exertion and a garden of pleasure. Sometimes, indeed, a noxious plant will peep above the surface of the soil; occasionally an interposing cloud will cast a gloom over its loveliest flowers, or the nipping blasts will scatter their beauties; but still it possesses attractions sufficient to charm the eye, exhilarate the spirits, and gladden the heart. Here everything is delicious, beautiful, and fragrant. The man of intellect, the man of taste, and the man of feeling, may each find a rich repast. Here Meditation may reflect, Pleasure may revel, and Piety adore.

IV.—THE CONSTITUTION OF RELIGIOUS SOCIETIES.

Forms of government and ordinary occupations have a great influence on national character, and this influence is manifested in all the operations in which the nation is called to

engage. Hence, in our own country, the inhabitants of which are blessed with a representative government, and who are occupied in commercial pursuits, all our *voluntary* associations are governed on the representative system. Our incorporated commercial bodies, our insurance offices, and all our joint-stock companies, are governed by delegates, who are chosen by the body of the proprietors, and to these proprietors the delegates, at stated periods, report the proceedings they have thought proper to adopt. The idea of representation never occurred to the ancients, or, if it did, they never incorporated it in their political institutions. But the annual meetings of a parliament chosen by the people have long ago familiarized this idea to a British mind. The idea of agency, or appointing another person to act for the principal, is one of the earliest notions that would be suggested by an extended commerce. From these circumstances, and from the obvious advantages of the measure, it is no matter of surprise that the public bodies above alluded to should adopt the government they have established; and as this was the case when our religious and charitable associations rose into existence, it might easily have been predicted that they would adopt a form of government similar to that by which other public societies had been directed. Hence we find that all our societies chose from themselves a certain number of persons, whom collectively they style a committee, and who have the management of the society; subject, however, to the control of the members at large. We shall now enter into an examination of the constitution of these societies; we shall consider first the members, next the committee, and then the other officers of the society. We shall begin with the members, and shall consider their qualifications and their privileges.

I. We shall consider the *qualifications* of members. What constitutes a member? In a commercial country nothing can be done without money. In order to carry into operation any scheme of benevolence, we may use the same language which was employed by a French general respecting war—"In order to be successful, we must have, first, money; secondly, money; thirdly, money." Hence it is,

that in most cases money constitutes the qualification of a member.

1. The first class of members are those who become so by an annual subscription. The law generally runs thus: "Every subscriber of one guinea or upwards, annually, shall be considered a member of this society." Some societies descend so low as half-a-guinea. We observe one society states a guinea or half-a-guinea. This is superfluous; for if half-a-guinea's subscription constituted a member, a guinea's subscription would of course. We suppose it was meant to be intimated that half-a-guinea would do, but a guinea would do better. We would strongly recommend to all religious societies to use every effort to increase the number of their members. A society which is supported principally by these can always calculate pretty accurately on the amount of the next year's revenue, and hence judge of the propriety of engaging in any new source of expense. Whereas a society dependent on collections and occasional donations is always in a state of fluctuation, and a thousand things may arise to injure its funds, and thus involve the society in serious embarrassments. The subscriptions of the members are the fixed revenue of the society. At the same time it must be confessed, that to get new members is not always a very easy affair. Even liberal men prefer putting their money on the plate at a collection to having their names enrolled as members. This conduct sometimes arises from modesty: they do not like ostentatiously to display their names in print. This, however, may be easily obviated, as they may, if they please, adopt Greek, Latin, or French names; the money is the same. But perhaps it more generally arises from an aversion to turn a gift into a debt, for

> "Generous lords would rather give than pay."

When a man puts his name down as a subscriber, he is considered under a sort of obligation; the money is applied for as a matter of course, rather than received as a favour. Much depends on association: the sight of a collector taking out his book, and asking for our subscription, always reminds

us of a tax-gatherer, and the very idea is enough to make us wish him a thousand miles off. In giving at a collection, too, a person may give what he pleases; but when his name and subscription are to be published, he thinks it necessary, for his credit, that he should not give an insignificant amount.

But from whatever motive a benevolent individual may decline becoming a member of a charitable association, the conduct is unquestionably wrong. We consider it absolutely sinful for a person holding an influential situation in society to "do good by stealth." We are commanded to let our light shine before men, that others may see our good works; and it becomes every Christian philanthropist to further the cause to which he is attached, not merely by his purse, but also by his example. A man who silently puts a guinea on the plate confers a benefit on the society only to that amount; but he who puts his name down as an annual subscriber for a guinea, not only gives his money, but also his patronage, and by his example many others may be induced to engage in the same work. A cowardly secrecy in the exercise of benevolence is often more injurious than even an ostentatious display. We suspect, however, that an aversion to ostentation is often assumed as a mask for close-fistedness. Men tell us they never boast of their charities! How can they? they perform none. Are there no characters, even in the religious world, who will not subscribe to one institution, lest, by publishing their names, they should receive from other societies similar applications?

2. The second class comprises those who, by a donation to a certain amount, have become life-members. By paying down ten guineas at once, you may become a member for life. This is very convenient for those who at present have plenty of money, but are not sure that in future years their supplies will be so abundant. It is more respectable to an individual to have ten guineas standing opposite to his name than a poor solitary one: it confers, too, a greater advantage on the society. The necessities of all our societies are present, and their operation is immediate. A sum paid now may be more useful than double the sum ten years hence, and certainly considerably more than an annual subscription

of equal value. But let us examine this subject as a question of finance. We will suppose that the annual subscriber of one guinea intends to continue his subscription during his life. Now he can acquire the same privilege of membership by paying ten guineas at once, that is, by ten years' purchase. An annuity on the life of a person fifty-six years of age, calculated at four cent., is worth about ten years' purchase; hence it is for the advantage of all persons under this age to become at once members for life instead of annual members. This will be the cheapest way of purchasing a membership. At the same time, when we take into consideration the possibility of the individual not subscribing all his life, it will appear to be a safe bargain on the part of the society. We know the old proverb, "A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush." With respect to those persons who have unfortunately advanced beyond this age, they will best save their money (and at this age people are often anxious to save money) by making an annual subscription. But, by the way, we would just whisper in their ear, that if they have remembered the society in their will, as the time will not be long, they may as well give it at once, and that will save the society the expense of legacy duty. We fixed the age at fifty-six, but we went by the Northampton tables. Had we made our calculations from the London tables, we should have said fifty-one—so injurious is the atmosphere, or perhaps we should say more correctly, so injurious are the manners and habits of large cities—that they have a considerable influence in shortening human life.

3. Another class of members in some societies includes ministers who are not subscribers, but who make collections for the institution at their place of worship. This regulation we deem exceedingly proper: it is an act of justice towards the congregation. Collections to any amount do not entitle the contributors to the privilege of membership; and hence it will be some gratification for the people to know that by their benefactions their minister will be constituted a member of the society. It is also an act of justice to the minister himself. Who have been the chief means of awakening the

liberality of the age? Who are the framers of our religious charities? Who are the most efficient speakers on the Platform? Who are the most useful agents in carrying our plans into execution? Are they not the ministers? But apart from the general respect to which the clerical order is entitled, a minister who collects at his chapel renders to the society an advantage which justly entitles him to the privilege of membership. The collection itself is a larger sum than any individual subscription that could be expected from the minister; and by permitting the interest of the association to be pleaded in his pulpit, he extends its influence through a wider circle, which may ultimately be exceedingly productive.

It is naturally expected that ministers, who are the leaders of our benevolent societies, will, in their own conduct, exhibit the generosity they inculcate on others. In a common soldier cowardice is contemptible, but in a commander it is shocking; equally heinous would be stinginess in a minister. We believe ministers fully answer the public expectation. We believe they are the most liberal class of men in society; but to expect that every minister would, out of his own resources, subscribe to every religious charity that might be pressed upon his attention, would be unreasonable and absurd; nevertheless he can show his good-will to all, by giving occasionally a collection to each. We stated our belief that ministers were the most liberal class of men in society; but we must also state that, like other classes, the most opulent individuals are not the most liberal. Unhappily, rich benefices, fortunate legacies, and wealthy marriages, do not always increase the disposition to be generous.

4. Another class includes those who have become life-members in consequence of paying legacies left to the society. An executor, who pays a legacy of fifty pounds, shall be a life member. If ever angels laugh at human folly, it must be when they see a rich old sinner endeavouring, on his death-bed, to build a bridge to heaven by leaving his money to religious societies. A man, whose "bones are full of the sins of his youth," expects to atone for his crimes by leaving money to a penitentiary. Another hopes, by the amount of

his legacies at his death, to make some compensation for the avarice and hard-heartedness of his life. But such conduct does not always arise from remorse. There are cases in which persons, from pious motives, may bequeath property which they could not prudently part with during their life. But it would be both ungrateful and presumptuous for the managers of our religious charities to scrutinize the motives of their benefactors—"They take what is set before them, asking no questions for conscience' sake." They have not the power to express to the donor their gratitude for his favours; and hence to constitute the executor a life member of the society is a very proper tribute of respect.

II. We shall proceed to a consideration of the *privileges* of members.

1. Members have a right to vote at the public meetings of the society. Conducted as our public meetings are, this can hardly be called a privilege. Our doors are thrown wide open; we court the entrance of strangers, who have full liberty to vote; and the resolutions generally proposed can hardly provoke a difference of opinion. If, however, at any time, the committee of any society should be guilty of a breach of duty, or even of gross imprudence, or should they disagree among themselves, an appeal would of course be made to the society at large; and in this case only members could be allowed to vote.

2. In the public meetings, members have a right to canvass the resolutions proposed. We stated that generally the resolutions proposed will not admit of a difference of opinion. This, however, is not always the case; and we do conceive that any person who is a member of a society has a right to oppose, both by voting and speaking, any resolution which he disapproves. We are aware that our proposition will not be universally admitted. We recollect reading the proceedings of a meeting at which a bishop presided. A person rose to speak: the worthy prelate asked if he were appointed to speak by the committee, and, on receiving an answer in the negative, would not suffer him to proceed; observing that, if he wished to attack the society, he might do so from the

press. Now we are ready to admit that none but members have any right to speak at all. We are ready to admit that even members have no right to originate any resolutions of their own, as this properly belongs to the committee; but we do contend, that when any resolution is proposed for the adoption of the members of the society, and two persons who perhaps are not members are appointed to advocate this resolution; we do contend, that in such a case any member has a right to stand up and refute the arguments that may be advanced in its favour. If this be not the case, what is it but mere mockery to put the resolution at all? The members have unquestionably a right of voting against it; and if a right of voting, why not of speaking?

We really think it is very desirable that this method should be pursued more frequently. What a tameness often hangs over our public meetings! How often do the speakers, secure of public favour, appear languid and indifferent! Let but an eloquent opponent make his appearance; immediately the audience are all eagerness—the speakers are all life: there is an enemy to conquer; there is honour to be attained; the combatants engage with energy, and every countenance exhibits the interest which is taken in the contest.

We shall, perhaps, be told, that if every member should avail himself of this privilege, our public meetings would be reduced to scenes of confusion. This is supposing a case which can never occur. It is not possible that all the members of any society could wish to address the meeting; and if several should wish to do so, what confusion is likely to occur? The meeting may sometimes be protracted to an inconvenient length; but where is the ground of confusion? It would have the effect of increasing the interest, and consequently the pleasures, of the audience; and were our speakers likely to meet with opponents, they would endeavour to become masters of their subject; they would keep close to the point, and not so readily diverge into that sermonizing strain in which they are so apt to indulge. If, as Paley contends, whatever is expedient is right, then the question is decided; for this privilege of the members, so far

as it has been exercised, has hitherto produced nothing but unmingled good.

3. Members have a right to choose the committee and other officers of the society. Nothing can be more just than that a number of persons who have raised funds to accomplish any purpose should have the power of choosing the agents for carrying their plans into execution. And this is more necessary when those agents must, from the circumstances of the case, have the sole management of the affairs, and, according to their own discretion, dispose as they please of the funds of the society. The society in all cases chooses the committee. In regard to the other officers of the society, we conceive they should be chosen by the committee, and the choice confirmed by the society; for should the society choose officers, however respectable they might be, who did not possess the confidence of the committee, it would prevent all co-operation, and materially affect the interests of the institution.

4. The members are entitled to the publications of the society. As the committee and the other officers are only the agents of the society, it is proper they should render to their principal an account of the services they have performed. The circulation of this intelligence will also maintain the zeal of the society, and perhaps also increase the number of its members. This account is usually given in the monthly, quarterly, and annual reports. We think nothing tends more to promote the prosperity than a wise and constant appeal from the press. It is not sufficient to excite public feeling; the impression must be maintained. The object will soon slip from the recollection when it ceases to meet the eye. We know that some of our societies have been accused of excessive expense in regard to printing. We shall not hazard an opinion as to the justice of this charge; but we believe that in most cases the increase of subscribers which is procured by their publication amply repays the expense of printing. We confess we are not friendly to voluminous reports. They certainly defeat the end in view, for not one in ten of them is ever read. Who, in the

name of wonder, when journals, magazines, and reviews are tumbling in upon us week after week, and month after month; when our sciences become so numerous, that their very names would fill a volume, and yet we are expected to have a smattering of them all; and when we have to mind these things in addition to our ordinary engagements: when this is the case, who, in the name of wonder, can find time to read two or three hundred pages respecting the proceedings of a religious society? If an agent of one of these societies were to call and leave us a report containing only a few pages, we should probably sit down and read it at once; but we are astounded when presented with a thick octavo. "What," we exclaim, "what! all this for a guinea?" We never think of reading it then, but lay it on the shelf, with the intention of perusing it at some leisure hour, which, of course, never arrives. Our daughters sometimes look over the list of subscriptions, to see which of their acquaintances give away most money; and this is the only use which is made of a "very interesting report." We wish not to be understood as speaking against these publications: they are exceedingly valuable, and have served not only to stimulate Christian zeal, but also to supply authentic information respecting a variety of important subjects. They exhibit the effects of genuine piety, and are pleasing records of Christian benevolence; but we wish to be understood as speaking in condemnation of very long reports. Were the information which is heaped together in one volume, and presented us at the end of the year, divided into several portions, and given to us at shorter intervals, our appetite for religious information would be relieved without being satiated; and by these occasional supplies the pulsations of our benevolence would be kept in healthy motion.

There are some societies the members of which have peculiar privileges. Some benevolent societies allow their members to recommend a certain number of objects to be relieved, in proportion to their subscription. These are institutions of a superior class, such as hospitals and infirmaries, where the subscribers, who are styled governors, elect the officers and servants of the house; by which means rich men have some-

times an opportunity of placing a needy dependent in a comfortable situation.

But advantages of a higher order now press on our recollection. We feel our mind pervaded with a reverential awe, and we wrap our faces in our mantle, while, issuing from the Temple of Truth, and breaking on our ears in accents of celestial sweetness, the voice of the Almighty claims our attention. "Blessed is he that considereth the poor: the Lord will deliver him in time of trouble. The Lord will preserve him, and keep him alive; and he shall be blessed upon the earth." "He that hath pity upon the poor lendeth unto the Lord; and that which he hath given will He pay him again." "Honour the Lord with thy substance, and with the first-fruits of all thine increase; so shall thy barns be filled with plenty, and thy presses shall burst out with new wine." "Verily I say unto you, There is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my sake, and the gospel's, but he shall receive an hundredfold now in this time, and in the world to come eternal life."

V.—THE ADMINISTRATION OF RELIGIOUS SOCIETIES.

Most, if not all, of our religious associations are governed by a committee, chosen at a general meeting of the members. A committee is a deliberative assembly, in which every measure is previously discussed. By this previous discussion, the society has the advantage of the talents of all the individuals of the whole committee. What one omits another can supply; and considerations which had escaped the notice of one person will be suggested by his friend. As the individuals who compose the committee are drawn from different ranks and pursuits in life, and occupy different spheres of observation, the accumulated information furnished by these individual contributions will be the surest guide in pointing out all the bearings of any measure about to be adopted. The members of a committee should be disin-

terested. They who oppose our religious institutions are fond of throwing out insinuations against the integrity of our managers; they insinuate that those who devote their time to benevolent societies do so from interested motives, and always contrive to get well paid for their trouble. It was necesssary to guard against attacks of this description; it was necessary so to model our institutions as to challenge investigation and to surmount suspicion; hence we place the government of our institutions in the hands not of one person, but of many. Supposing even that one man may be dishonest, is it likely that twenty or thirty men will be so, especially when all the financial details of their proceedings are to come before the public? Besides, our committees are selected from the most respectable class of society, and from men who were before unknown to each other, and who cannot have any single bond of union. One of our institutions has placed among its laws a regulation which we believe is acted upon in most societies: "No person supplying the society with any article of trade shall sit on the committee."

In all societies the committee includes a certain proportion of ministers. This proportion is usually specified in the laws; sometimes it is one-half, sometimes one-third. We think the greater number of ministers in a committee the better. It is true that laymen, from their secular connections, are often enabled to supply the society with useful information, but it is the ministers alone who can enforce the claims of the society on the public attention. A minister who is a member of the committee will, in consequence of this connection, feel himself induced to give the society a collection in his place of worship, and hence will promote in a greater degree the pecuniary interests of the institution.

Committees vary in regard to the number of their members. A committee composed of many members has the advantage over one composed but of few: a superior degree of information and of wisdom may be expected; the concerns of the society are not so likely to get into the hands of a few individuals; and a sufficient number will always be procured to conduct the business, though many of the members may

not attend. One inconvenience attends a large committee—there is sure to be a great deal of wrangling, and often, too, about trifles; but the increased interest which the members will feel in the affairs of the society, by means of this ardent debate, will more than counterbalance any inconvenience that may be occasioned by an irrelevant or a lengthened discussion.

Different rules are adopted for regulating the succession of the members who compose the committee. In some societies a new committee must be elected every year, though the members of the former committee are eligible for re-election; sometimes a fourth of the committee go out every year in rotation; sometimes it is that fourth who have least frequently attended. Each plan has its advantages, and each its disadvantages. For a society of moderate extent, the first mode is perhaps the best; in a large society, where no difficulty is experienced in procuring committee-men, the second mode should be adopted; the third plan is decidedly the worst: quarrelsome men who may have an object in view, and dull men who have nothing else to do with their time, are by these means rendered permanent members of the committee. Hence the society necessarily falls under the government of a few individuals, whose only merit is constant attendance.

In addition to these regular members of the committee, who are chosen by the subscribers at their annual meetings, many societies have adopted certain rules by which the number of members composing their committees is considerably increased. By the laws of the British and Foreign Bible Society, every subscriber of five guineas annually, every executor paying a bequest of 100*l.*, and every clergyman or dissenting minister who is a member of the society, are enabled to attend and vote at all meetings of the committee. But though these persons are thus constituted members of the committee, we believe very few of them act as committee-men. They may, however, be useful; they may attend and vote if they please; and they probably would do so were the acting committee to adopt regulations

worthy of censure. Hence these supernumerary members of the committee may be regarded as a court of appeal, whose decision we may claim in extraordinary cases.

We shall now proceed to the other officers of the society. *Patrons, presidents,* and *vice-presidents* are useless beings as far as concerns the management of the society's business. In other respects they may be of service. These offices are generally held by persons of wealth or rank, who thus give importance to the society in the estimation of the world. This connection, too, with the members of the royal family, and with the nobility and gentry of the land, serves to throw off from the members of our benevolent societies that stigma of disloyalty which ungodly men of every age have endeavoured to fasten on the friends of religion. Those societies, the constitution of which does not admit of patrons, presidents, and vice-presidents, have other means of employing the influence of their friends. This is usually done by electing them members of the committee; hence most of our popular ministers are members of various committees, the meetings of which they are never expected to attend. They merely lend their names as a recommendation of the object and constitution of the society.

The *treasurer* should always be a man of wealth. He will then be less liable to a suspicion of wishing to derive personal emolument from his office, and will also be able to make advances to the society in case circumstances should render it advisable to have such accommodation. The treasurer has no power to expend any money but by the vote of the committee. Hence, every grant having received previous discussion, and having been voted by the majority of the committee, the public have the strongest pledge for the prudent and faithful application of their funds. According to the rules of some associations, the treasurer is the chairman of all their public meetings. We do not perceive the utility of this. It may be proper enough that he should be the chairman of the committee, because that is an office which often requires a knowledge of the laws and operations of the society, but at the public meetings no such knowledge

is necessary. The practice of having the chair always filled by the treasurer prevents the society paying an acceptable compliment to a man of rank and influence by inviting him to take the chair. The society thus loses the advantage which such a circumstance would impart, and the public meeting is deprived of one source of attraction.

The *secretary* is unquestionably the most useful officer of a society. He is the society's right hand. Few stations in the Christian Church require so many qualifications as this: wisdom to contrive, energy to act, prudence to anticipate, promptness to overcome, firmness to persevere, and mildness to conciliate; all these are necessary in order to fill with honour this important post. It seems indispensably necessary that this office should be filled by a minister. It will often be expedient that the secretary should plead the cause of the society from the pulpit, which, if he be a layman, he cannot do. Most of the active agents and correspondents of the society are ministers, and they will pay more respect to an application from a minister than from a layman. Besides, laymen, from their avocations and pursuits, acquire a business style of writing not exactly adapted to the affairs of a religious society; they speak of the institution in the same way as they would talk of the course of exchange, or of a bale of Manchester goods. A secretary should not be a very poor preacher; it is bad policy to push a man into a secretaryship merely because he is fit for nothing else: properly to uphold the dignity of his office, he ought to be a minister who is respected by his brethren. Ability as a preacher, and cleverness as a man of business, are no doubt but rarely combined; yet it seems necessary that the secretary of a religious society should possess both these attainments.

Auditors are gentlemen appointed to check the society's accounts previous to each annual meeting. To them all the receipts and vouchers of the payment of money are produced; they examine all the items of expense, and see that the financial statement is correct. Hence, over and above the security furnished by the constitution of the committee, the public have here another pledge for the faithful applica-

tion of their funds. The auditors should not be ministers, but men of business; nor should they be members of the committee, or in any other way have any active connection with the society.

With regard to those minor officers who abound in some of our overgrown societies, the clerks, the collectors, the messengers, &c.,—as persons holding these offices are required merely to possess qualifications which are necessary to the tenure of similar situations in commercial and other establishments, we shall not bestow upon them any particular consideration.

We have thus taken notice of some of the principal circumstances connected with the Platform. We have contrasted the Platform with the Pulpit; we have traced its influence on society; we have pointed out the imperfections of the Platform; and we have taken a short review of the constitution and the administration of our religious societies. And now, brethren, depart in peace, for here we take down our Platform. *Souvenez-vous des pauvres, et le Dieu de paix vous accompagne dans vos familles.*

THE PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

PAGE

The Philosophy of History 351

LECTURE I.

The Philosophy of Geographical History 355

LECTURE II.

The Philosophy of Domestic History 404

LECTURE III.

The Philosophy of Political History 459

APPENDIX TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF POLITICAL HISTORY.

Government and Laws of the Jews 505

PREFACE.

In my "Logic for the Million," I have referred to these Lectures in the following terms:—"Some years ago I commenced a work on the Philosophy of History. It was purposed to be written in the form of Lectures. After writing three Lectures, I was compelled, from want of leisure, to lay the subject aside. The commencement of the work may now, for the first time, be useful by standing at the head of this section,"—the section on "The Application of the Art of Reasoning to History."

These Lectures were written so long ago as the summer of the year 1826, but were never published, nor at that time had I ever lectured.

A few months after they were written, I became a manager of a Joint-Stock Bank, and this new position gave a new direction to my studies. The "Philosophy of History" gave place to the Literature of Banking; and although the acceptance with which my writings on Banking were received by the public was, doubtless, owing mainly to my practical acquaintance with the subject, and to their being published at a time when the principles of Joint-Stock Banking required the aid of literary advocacy, yet it is not un-

reasonable to suppose that some of their claims to public attention were the effect of those intellectual labours which had formed the amusement of my youth: if so, they may serve to inculcate the lesson, that young men should endeavour to improve the talents they possess, even when there is no prospect of immediate advantage, as they know not how soon they may be placed in a position in which those talents may be useful, not only to themselves, but to the community at large.

J. W. G.

London, January 1, 1857.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY.

INTRODUCTION.

PHILOSOPHY has been defined, "the knowledge of the reasons of things," in opposition to History, which is the bare knowledge of facts; or to Mathematics, which is the knowledge of the quantities of things, or their measures. It is the province of Philosophy to collect together these facts which have occurred, to investigate their causes and operations, and to classify them according to the principles they may have developed. It is thus that the chemist takes every object in nature, examines their constituent principles, notices their operation when brought into combination with other bodies; and from the effects he observes, he forms those general rules which are universally true, and which, when arranged and demonstrated, form what may be called the Philosophy of the Science.

Thus it is in every branch of Experimental Philosophy. At first, the substances of water, or air, or other natural objects, are merely observed. By-and-by a few experiments are made upon them; other experiments follow, and either correct or confirm those which preceded. Experiments are multiplied, until it is found at last that, in a variety of instances, the same experiments are uniformly followed by the same results. These are then considered as established truths. The knowledge thus acquired is acted upon in the investigation of other bodies; fresh truths are elicited; and

the whole system of truths, or general principles, thus established by repeated experiments, constitute what is termed Natural and Experimental Philosophy.

But this course of procedure is not confined to material substances. The moralist observes minutely what actions conduce to happiness, and what lead to misery. Those actions which lead to happiness he calls good or virtuous; those actions which lead to misery he calls bad or vicious. He examines the causes or motives from whence those actions proceed, and he considers the motives to be good or evil according to the good or bad actions they produce. Hence he forms general rules, by which he declares that certain classes of actions or motives are good, and ought to be inculcated; while other classes of actions and motives are evil, and ought to be condemned. He compares these rules with the relations which man sustains in reference to other beings in the universe. Hence to examine the reasonableness and propriety of moral conduct, and to investigate and lay down rules for moral action, constitute what is termed the science of Moral Philosophy.

Thus, too, the political economist views the increase and the diminution of those products which constitute national wealth. He traces the various circumstances by which either the one or the other may be promoted; and from the observation of individual examples and instances, he lays down general principles for the regulation of future conduct in affairs of state economy. This constitutes the philosophy of the science.

Political Economy bears the same relation to history as morals do to biography. History records those facts which have occurred in the affairs of nations. From these facts Political Economy derives her principles; she arranges these facts, not according to their chronological order, but accordingly as they concurred in exhibiting the good or evil of any line of political conduct. So biography records those events which have occurred in the lives of individuals; and the moralist hence derives principles for the regulation of individual conduct.

All philosophy, whether it refer to material or immaterial subjects, is founded on fact. It is not philosophy to build castles in the air, to fancy theories, and then maintain them in defiance of evidence. If we wish to lay any claim to the character of philosophers, we must not first assume principles, and then hunt for facts in order to establish them; but our principles must be deductions from the facts with which we were previously acquainted.

When, however, the facts by which our principles are supported are so numerous, or so decisive, that few persons are disposed to dispute the conclusion to which they lead, it is not always necessary, in teaching our general principles, to detail all the individual facts upon which they may be founded. A few pertinent examples are sufficient for the purpose.

From what I have said, none of my auditors will be at a loss to conjecture what ideas I attach to the Philosophy of History. The Philosophy of History means those general principles which the facts of history clearly establish. It is not, therefore, my intention to detail all the events which are recorded in the page of history. I shall attempt to exhibit those principles which are deduced from those events, and shall consider those events themselves not in their chronological order, but as they tend to establish the principles I may have previously advanced.

The Philosophy of History takes a much wider range than Political Economy. The economist views only those facts which have an influence on the accumulation of national wealth. The philosopher views, also, those facts which have a reference to the character of man, to the development of his physical powers, the exercise of his intellectual faculties, his progress in scientific inquiry, the formation of domestic and civil society, and his performance of moral and religious duties.

In pursuing these inquiries, I propose to deliver five Lectures. The first will be on the Philosophy of Geographical History; the second, the Philosophy of Domestic History; the third, the Philosophy of Political History; the fourth, the

Philosophy of Intellectual History; the fifth, the Philosophy of Ecclesiastical History.

In the first Lecture, upon the Philosophy of Geographical History, I propose to inquire what are the effects which History records to have been produced upon man, and upon human society, by geographical circumstances, by the varieties of climate, by the mountainous character of countries, by the fertility or barrenness of the soil, or by the intervention of rivers or arms of the sea.

In the second Lecture I shall inquire what is the language of History as to the relation of husband and wife, the institutions of polygamy and divorce, the relation between parents and children, masters and servants, and the rise and progress of domestic slavery. This Lecture will be on the Philosophy of Domestic History.

In the third Lecture, upon the Philosophy of Political History, I shall inquire what is the evidence of History as to the origin of government, the advantages and disadvantages of particular forms of government, and the union of the simple forms in the British Constitution.

In the fourth Lecture, on the Philosophy of Intellectual or Scientific History, I shall inquire into the circumstances which have developed the intellectual faculties, the rise and progress of the arts, the circumstances by which they are promoted or retarded, the advantages which the moderns have over the ancients, and the benefits to be expected from universal education.

In the fifth Lecture, upon the Philosophy of Ecclesiastical History, I propose to examine whether it is obvious from History that man is endowed with a moral sense; to inquire what are the different forms of polytheism, and how far it is necessary that the Church should be established by the civil power; and to trace the influence of religion upon the political, intellectual, and social happiness of man.*

* The two last Lectures were never written; *vide* Preface.

LECTURE I.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF GEOGRAPHICAL HISTORY.

WERE we to suppose that an individual, endowed with sensations similar to our own, were to arrive on a visit from some distant planet, the first impressions he would receive would be those of heat or cold. Had he arrived from a colder region, he would feel warm; had he arrived from a warmer region, he would feel cold. On casting his eyes around, he would perceive a great inequality in the surface of the earth, and hence would soon form ideas of mountains and plains. He would observe, too, that the various parts of the earth were greatly diversified by their different degrees of fertility; and hence he would become acquainted with fertile lands and desert countries. On travelling he would arrive speedily to a softer kind of substance, unable to support his weight, and which, for the most part, was in perpetual motion; hence he would form ideas of rivers, lakes, seas, and oceans.

In this order, I shall consider the various geographical circumstances that are observable on the surface of the earth, and observe the effect which these circumstances produce, or are supposed to produce, upon the character and condition of mankind.

Climate is, on many accounts, deserving of the first consideration. The earth has been divided into twenty-four climates. But this division of climates, according to their distance from the equator, is by no means correct. The climate of a country is regulated not only by the distance from the equator, but also by the height of its mountains, its elevation above the level of the sea, its exposure to cold or hot winds, and the state of its cultivation. By climate, then, I mean a degree of cold, by whatever means that cold may be produced. A warm country is in a warm climate; a cold country is in a cold climate.

Few subjects have occupied the attention of philosophers

more than the influence which is alleged to be exercised by climate upon the character of man. That there is a variety of climates upon the surface of the globe is an obvious fact, although the climates of different countries do not always correspond with the parallels of latitude. It is no less obvious that there is a vast variety in the characters and dispositions of different nations. The question for examination is, whether the one is the cause of the other?

It is obvious, too, tbat the legitimate way of deciding this question is by referring to the page of History. We must not judge by previously-conceived theories, however plausible, but by a reference to facts; and if we find conflicting facts bearing opposing evidence, we must be regulated by the majority of instances. For, amid a multitude of instances, those which form the majority must be considered as establishing a general rule, and the others must be deemed exceptions.

What, then, is the language of History in reference to the influence of climate? Do we not find that in cold climates men are more industrious, more enterprising, and more courageous? Do we not find that the people enjoy more political liberty, a purer religion, and a higher degree of intellectual culture? Do we not find that the morals are more pure, crimes are less frequent, and a greater regard is paid to cleanliness and propriety of conduct?

If we view the state of Europe in the present day, and read the accounts which are given us by travellers of the state of Italy, Spain, and Portugal, and contrast these accounts with the journals of those travellers who have passed through England, Scotland, Denmark, Sweden, and Germany, the advantages will certainly appear to be greatly in favour of the cold and northern climates. Whether we look at the land, and see how cultivation is extended; whether we view the natural advantages of the respective countries, and see in what way they are improved; whether we enter their habitations, and examine their regard to domestic luxury, or their enjoyment of social comforts; or whether we compare the inhabitants in respect either to their intellectual, their moral,

or their political character, we shall find that the inhabitants of the northern climates have an immense superiority over those of the south. In passing through the southern nations of Europe we find lands ill cultivated, marshes extending themselves in places formerly covered with corn; we find natural advantages neglected; we meet with rivers without bridges, sea-coasts without any ships, provinces without roads, cities without wealth. Man there lies in a state of inactivity, reposing beneath a sultry sun. Too lazy to work at any kind of labour beyond what is necessary to mere existence, he thinks that the enjoyments of life are not worth the exertion necessary for their attainment. Hence he rolls in filth, deprived of every pleasure but that of repose. By his aversion to labour, he is clothed in rags; drags out his miserable existence in a wretched habitation, exposed to every evil by which he may be assailed. Possessed of no independence of mind, he submits implicitly to any tyrant who may think it worth while to extend his sceptre over him; and, in return for this submission to tyranny, he meets with no protection. Thieves abound; and no police is strong enough to protect him from their attacks. This furnishes another plea for the suspension of industry; for who would labour when he has no security that he shall enjoy the fruits of his exertions?

Such, with few exceptions, is the case with the people of those countries in the southern climate of Europe. Let us now pass into Asia. There is, perhaps, no one circumstance by which we can judge so well of the character of a nation as by its attention to industry. Wherever we behold the mass of the people eagerly engaged in profitable labour, we may rest assured that that country is in a state of progressive advancement; that there the people are honest, generous, frank, and enterprising; and that they possess a goodly portion of the comforts and luxuries of life.

On passing into Asia, we find the inhabitants of its warm and fertile plains marked by idleness and slavery. The Turk, groaning beneath a despotism he has not courage or energy to resist, basks on his mat beneath the beams of an Oriental sun, while all things around bear the marks of poverty and

desolation. Passing into India, we find sixty millions of people quietly submitting to the government of a few thousands of Europeans: while, farther east, we find the gigantic empire of China, of whose southern provinces the natives exhibit all the characteristics of the inhabitants of the other southern countries.

Passing into Africa, where all groan beneath a burning sky, we find that all are destitute of that intellectual life and energy which distinguishes the inhabitants of the temperate zones.

If we travel to America, we there find that the inhabitants of the northern climates, the descendants of our own country, though they have a country inferior in fertility to the south, though they had to clear their land before they could cultivate it, yet have they far advanced beyond the puny colonies of the south, who but lately have been roused into a sense of their privileges as men, and who, probably, never would have been roused had not the inhabitants of the north set them the example.*

On the other hand, the inhabitants of the warm climates appear to possess a sensibility, an ingenuity, a taste for the fine arts, not to be found among the people of the north. Our singers and our musicians, our painters and our sculptors, are brought from a southern clime. There the elegant arts flourished for ages, when the rest of Europe was involved in barbarism.

If we take a view of general history, we shall discover that characteristics similar to those I have described have belonged to hot and cold countries in every age of the world.

Nineveh and Egypt are the oldest nations of which we have any account in profane history. One or the other of these was probably the parent of the Arts: both of them were situated in warm climates. The inhabitants of both

* This refers to the declaration of independence by the Spanish colonies in South America. With regard to the original inhabitants, Dr. Robertson remarks that "a despotic government was only among those tribes of America whose situation was within or on the borders of the torrid zones."

appear to be remarkable for their ingenuity, their attention to the Arts, and for their love of architecture. Both Nineveh and Babylon were remarkable for the splendid temples erected in honour of their gods, and for the superb palaces built for the residences of their kings; while in Egypt the lofty pyramids have struck with astonishment the architects of modern times.

These countries being situated in plains where nothing interposed to prevent the most extensive prospects, the inhabitants had a fine opportunity for making observations on the heavenly bodies; hence they naturally commenced the study of astronomy. But they degraded this noble science by associating it with their own superstitious notions respecting their gods. Astronomy was associated with astrology; and, instead of exalting, tended to debase the minds of the people.

But this knowledge, great as it was compared with that of the surrounding nations, appears to have been limited to few objects, and to have been confined wholly to the priesthood. The main body of the people appear to have exhibited those features which usually characterise the inhabitants of a warm climate. They were doubly slaves—slaves to their monarchs, and slaves to their priests. In a warm climate, where repose is the highest enjoyment, men have not activity or energy enough to assert their rights, as rational and thinking beings; hence, throughout the East, we meet with no form of government but the despotic. The sovereign is the master of the lives and the property of his subjects. We have a beautiful description of a despotic government in the account of Nebuchadnezzar:—"Whom he would he slew, and whom he would he kept alive; whom he would he set up, and whom he would he put down."

Nearly all the various forms of polytheism have derived their origin from warm climates. It was from Egypt that Greece and Rome obtained their mythology, though it was afterwards extended by the vain imaginations of their poets. A warm climate, probably, has a great effect upon the imagination; and often the faculty of the mind is most active

when the body is in a state of repose. The devotee of the East, excited by the exercise of a heated fancy, easily becomes the dupe of an artifice that wears the form of religion, and is induced to perform practices to which he could by no inferior motive be impelled. It was in the sultry climate of Arabia that the impostures of Mahomet were first disclosed; it was here that his first disciples were obtained. It was in the East that monasteries were first established; and they have always flourished most in warm climates, though one would have imagined that in these climates they would hardly have found an entrance. But the peculiar cast of thought to which the people of warm climates are exposed, induces them to acts of superstitious frenzy, of which no conception can be formed by the inhabitants of the temperate or colder regions.

It is obvious that the climate cannot affect the mind of man but by means of his body. That the body of man is affected by the heat or coldness of the climate, is a fact universally acknowledged. As the body of man possesses vegetable life, he will be affected, like other vegetables, by varieties of climate. In warm climates the growth of the human body is accelerated: man arrives soon at perfection, and soon decays. In Hindostan, girls are marriageable when twelve years old, and have the appearance of age at one-and-twenty.

Not only vegetable, but animal life appears affected by climate. Every climate has a peculiar race of animals, which cannot be removed to another climate without danger to their life. Even those animals which seem fitted to live in all climates, such as dogs and horses, do not attain the same perfection in all. The courage of bull-dogs and game-cocks seems peculiar to England. Flanders is remarkable for large and heavy horses; Spain for horses light and of good mettle. And any breed of these creatures transplanted from one country to another, will soon lose the qualities which they derived from their native climate. Why may not the body of man be operated upon in the same way?

If we refer to history, with a view of ascertaining the size and strength of men living under different climates, we shall

find that, in nearly all cases, the inhabitants of the northern climates have been larger and stronger men than the inhabitants of the southern climates. The Scythians, the Tartars, the Goths, the Huns, have always been represented as men of stature and of strength. It was only by their native robust constitution that they were able, at any time, to resist the disciplined troops of southern civilization. Indeed, were their size the same, their strength must have been greater. The strength of the human body increases in proportion as it is exercised. But in southern climes, where Nature pours forth spontaneously nearly all that is necessary for the sustenance of man, there is the less need of exertion, and, consequently, less exertion will be made; and in proportion as less exertion is made, the power of exertion will be diminished. But in northern climes, where Nature will do nothing but as she is assisted by the hand of man, labour is essential to existence. It is here that man is to gain his bread by the sweat of his brow. It is here he must break up the surface of the earth, that he must rear and guard his cattle, that he must sweep the rivers and the seas, and provide by every means against the change of the seasons and the rage of the elements. The labours in which he is engaged, and the hardships to which he is exposed, fortify the inhabitant of a northern climate; so that his constitution, rendered firm and resistant, is able to endure exertion and sustain fatigue. He grows up like an oak, slowly and firmly, and is yet vigorous while the snows of old age are falling around his shoulders; while he who basks beneath a southern sun, shoots suddenly up to maturity, lasts a few days, and is then swept away.

This strength and vigour of the animal system is associated (we know not how) with an energy and vigour of mind. A man who is feeble and sickly, is usually timid and cowardly. The man who is strong becomes conscious of his strength; hence he possesses more courage. Conscious of this strength, the man feels less necessity for having recourse to fraud and cunning; hence he possesses more frankness, less suspicion. Convinced of his superiority, he feels less desire of revenge.

Accustomed to labour, he has more patience and perseverance. In the habit of cool calculation against the approach of future evils, he feels less sensibility in the events of the passing day.

In proof of the superior strength and courage of the inhabitants of the northern climates, it may be observed, that nearly all the conquests have travelled south; that is to say, the northern nations have conquered the southern ones. Montesquieu has observed:—"Asia has been conquered thirteen times; eleven by the northern nations, and twice by those of the south. In the early ages it was conquered three times by the Scythians. Afterwards it was conquered once by the Medes, and once by the Persians. Again, by the Greeks, the Arabs, the Moguls, the Turks, the Tartars, the Persians, and the Affghans. I mention only the upper Asia, and say nothing of the invasions made in the rest of the south of that part of the world, which has continually suffered prodigious revolutions. In Europe, on the contrary, since the establishment of the Greek and Phœnician colonies, we know but of four great changes: the first caused by the conquest of the Romans; the second, by the inundations of the barbarians, who destroyed those very Romans; the third, by the victories of Charlemagne; and the last, by the invasions of the Normans. And if this be rightly examined, we shall find, even in these changes, a general strength diffused through all the parts of Europe."

In addition to these instances, it may be stated that China has been conquered several times by the Tartars.

It may here be remarked that success in war was, in ancient times, a much more decisive proof of superior strength and courage on the part of the conquerors, as a body, than it would be in modern times. Gunpowder was not invented. Fire-arms were unknown. Even then, no doubt, much depended on use and discipline; yet when they came to close quarters, the strongest and most courageous usually won the battle; hence it was that an army would sometimes beat another ten or twenty times its own number. But now, by the invention of gunpowder, success is a matter of calculation.

Victory usually attends superior numbers. Hence, no doubt, the invention of gunpowder has been been beneficial. It has rendered wars less destructive, and it has prevented many that would otherwise have occurred.

If we take a view of the four principal universal monarchies with which we are familiar, we shall find abundant proofs of the superiority of soldiers taken from a northern climate.

Nebuchadnezzar founded his universal monarchy soon after the first irruption of the northern tribes, who were then known by the name of Scythians. These Scythians were, after a hard struggle, defeated; and it is highly probable that many of them became soldiers in the army. Be that as it may, his army certainly consisted of soldiers drawn from many nations, and his career of conquest was south. Syria, Palestine, and Egypt were the principal countries he conquered.

The Medes and the Persians were still more north than the Babylonians, and they had to contend chiefly against southern nations.

The best of the soldiers of Alexander the Great were the troops of Macedon. The climate of this country is far more cold than that of Persia. Even Greece, from whence Alexander had the remainder of his army, does not lie so far south as the countries conquered by Alexander.

The Romans carried their arms east and west, north and south. But they were a much longer time conquering the cold countries than the warm ones. The whole of Asia was conquered in less time than the province of Gaul. The conquests of Pompey were more rapid than those of Cæsar. Their choicest troops were levied in Britain, in Gaul, and in the western parts of Europe. With these they easily defeated the inhabitants of the Oriental climes; and, when subdued, the Eastern nations were more easily kept in subjection. The main force of the Roman army, out of Italy, was stationed on the frontiers of France, to resist the incursions of the Germans; and in Britain, to resist the Scots. A legion was sufficient for the whole of Africa. And a few on the banks of the Euphrates, to resist the Parthians, were sufficient for the defence of their conquests in Asia.

The Romans were overthrown, it is well known, by the swarms that issued from the northern hive. It has been supposed that it was the numbers rather than the strength of the invaders that secured their victories; but the employments of the invaders had been either as hunters or shepherds; and, in either case, the countries from which they came could not have been very populous. It is certain, from the deserts they created, that the numbers they brought with them did not by any means replace the numbers they destroyed.

After the state of Europe had become in some degree settled, it was again ravaged by the Danes and the Normans, both issuing from the north. By their prowess they acquired settlements in some of the finest countries in Europe.

But, in regard to European nations, we shall not find it uniformly correct that the northern defeats the southern nation. In Europe, the heat decreases gradually from south to north: but there is no very great difference in the climate of two contiguous nations; and, consequently, climate has not much influence on the result. In Asia, however, the case is different. There is in that part of the world no temperate zone. At about forty degrees of latitude, a range of mountains runs from east to west, and divides the warm from the cold regions: hence the strong and the weak nations lie contiguous to one another. In their contests, the northern nations have usually defeated the southern.

May we not discern something similar in the history of modern Italy? When has Italy, single-handed, been able to resist an invader? For upwards of three centuries it has been the theatre on which France, Spain, and Germany have chosen to decide their quarrels, while the native Italians have been despised by all. In 1799, Napoleon Buonaparte fought his way through Italy, though opposed by the Austrian troops. The following year, the Russian general Suwarrow passed through it with equal ease; and shortly after, the French general conquered it again. In each case, neither party calculated upon any effectual opposition from the native Italians; they live in too warm a climate. In the recent Spanish contest, too, the chief burden of the war lay on the

English soldiers; the Spaniards did comparatively nothing: their mountaineers were their best warriors.

Not only have conquests passed from north to south; but it has also been found that after these northern nations have become settled in southern countries, they have changed their character, and have resembled the nations they had conquered. The modern Turks are the descendants of the ancient Scythians. The modern French are the descendants of the ancient Franks. The modern Spaniards are the descendants of the ancient Gauls. How vastly different are their characters! Now, what but climate can have produced this wonderful change? The Indian in America, the Negro in Africa, the Tartar in the north of Europe and Asia, have remained the same for ages. And if the Turks, the French, and the Spaniards had remained in their original climate, is it not likely that they, too, would have remained the same?

Another fact which shows the influence of climate is, that when colonies are sent from a cold to a warmer country, the colonists do not maintain, in their next generations, the strength and energy which distinguishes the parent state. At the time the Spaniards colonized South America, her soldiers were some of the best in Europe. The colonists were men of the most daring and enterprising character; to acquire their possessions, they performed prodigies of valour: yet their descendants were weak and powerless, and were far inferior to those Spaniards who were recently imported from Europe. It is true that the Spaniards in Europe have declined also, owing to various causes; but still, probably, they are superior at equal numbers to the colonists.

We find, too, that when expeditions are taken by the soldiers of a cold climate against the inhabitants of a warm climate, they are incapable of that energy of which they are capable in their own climate. In the war about the Spanish succession, German troops were sent to Spain; but they did not act with so much energy as their countrymen who were fighting in their native climate. The English soldiers who

fight in the East Indies, however superior they may be to the natives, are not equal, probably, to the English soldiers at home. We may know that by our own feelings. When oppressed by the summer heat, we feel little disposition to undertake any kind of arduous exertion.

When, too, the climate of a country has changed, we find it inhabited by a different race of people. I have already observed that the climate of a country—that is to say, its degree of heat or cold—does not depend solely on its distance from the equator. It is affected by its elevation above the sea, by the number and height of its mountains, by the winds to which it may be exposed, by the nature of its soil, and by the state of its cultivation. None of these seem to be under the control of man, except the last. Man can cut down woods, can drain marshes, can water and manure the soil, and plant it with useful vegetables. These operations render the climate warmer. A country covered with forests is always a cold country. The trees prevent the sun's rays reaching the earth, while, at the same time, they present a large extent of evaporating surface. When the trees are cut down, the earth imbibes and retains the rays of the sun, and there are fewer evaporating surfaces, and, consequently, fewer outlets for heat,—for evaporation always produces cold.

The principal instances we have in Europe of countries having undergone a change of climate are Germany, France, and Italy. At the times of the Romans, Germany was covered with impenetrable forests; the winters were rigorous in the extreme; the rivers were frozen over. The Romans never penetrated into Germany, where they imagined they could gain nothing, and had everything to lose. Gaul, which comprehended France, part of Belgium, and part of Switzerland, was distinguished by the severity of its climate. In Italy, the phrase, "a Gallic winter," was proverbial for a winter intensely cold; and people fled from those very provinces to which now our invalids repair during the winter, to avoid the rigours of our climate. In Italy, too, the climate has changed. Virgil speaks of the Tiber being frozen up for fifteen days together. Now it is scarcely ever seen to

snow; and to talk of the river being frozen would be deemed a reverie.

It is not difficult to ascertain the causes of the changes of climate in regard to Germany and France. It was, no doubt, the clearing of the woods, the draining of the marshes, and the cultivation of the soil, that produced this happy effect. But in regard to Italy the same causes cannot be assigned. No forests have been cut down; no marshes have been drained; no waste lands have been brought into cultivation. On the contrary, it is beyond all doubt that Italy is now much worse cultivated than it was in the time of Augustus Cæsar, and the marshes, it is notorious, have considerably increased: witness the *Pontine* marshes in the Papal states. We must, therefore, find some other cause. Some have supposed it to arise from the eruptions of Mounts Ætna and Vesuvius, from the opening of mines of sulphur, or from the *putrid vapours* arising from stagnant marshes; but whether these causes are satisfactory or not, the fact remains, as certain as any fact on the page of history, that Italy is not now subject to those visitations of ice and snow to which she was subject in former times.

The climate of America was for many years unwholesome to Europeans. Nearly half of the first bands of Puritans that landed in New England died under the influence of the climate; but as the lands were cleared and cultivation was extended, the climate became more salubrious.

The clearing the woods from some of the lands of Jamaica has had the effect of drying up some of the rivers; so that lands, formerly in a state of cultivation, cannot now be cultivated in consequence of the drought.

Some facts related by historians might lead us to conjecture that the climate of our own country had undergone a change. During the time of the Romans, the vine was cultivated in Britain; and this plant will not thrive but in a warm country. Our ancestors, too, it is said, were naked, and merely painted their bodies. This they would hardly do in a cold climate. But these facts do not appear to be conclusive. The vine of those times might not have been the same kind of plant as

that with which we are acquainted, or the Romans might have had some mode of cultivation which fortified it against the rigours of the seasons; and it is possible that, by practice, the natives might be able to exist without the use of clothes. From the extent to which cultivation is now carried, and from the general use of pit-coal, it seems more natural to suppose that our climate has rather improved. In the absence of facts, however, our reasonings on this subject will necessarily be defective.

But to return to Germany, France, and Italy. It is certain that the present inhabitants of these countries differ very much from their inhabitants in former times. The present Germans bear no resemblance to the Germans described by Cæsar and by Tacitus, even allowing for the changes produced by civilization. The present inhabitants of France differ in character, not only from the Franks, from whom they are mostly descended, but also from the Gauls, whom those Franks displaced; and we shall look in vain among the present inhabitants of Italy for any resemblance to the ancient Romans.

That a change in the climate of these countries should thus be attended with a change in the character of their inhabitants must be regarded as a curious coincidence. I do not mean to insist upon it as a positive proof that the change of climate was the sole cause of the change of character. I am not unacquainted with the revolutions these countries have undergone, the frequent immigrations of foreigners, the change of government and of religion, and the different state of the arts and sciences; but taking all these circumstances into consideration (and I shall more freely consider these in my future Lectures), there seems sufficient evidence to induce us to believe that climate must have had a considerable effect in producing these changes of character.

As it is a certain fact that the climates of countries have changed, and have become salubrious, from the extension of cultivation, we must not consider as hopeless the plan of colonizing the western coast of Africa. Our establishment at Sierra Leone has proceeded as prosperously as did the first

colonists in America. Were the native tribes to become civilized, were the wandering negroes to devote themselves to agriculture, were security of property and good government to be established, the western coasts of Africa might display as happy a scene of peace and prosperity as they have formerly exhibited of bloodshed and devastation. They might exhibit societies powerful in themselves, and a source of wealth to the countries by whom they were established.

If, then, it is the language of history that different climates have always been associated with differences in national character; if, when nations have passed from one climate to another, their character has changed; if, when the climate of a country has been changed, it is found to be inhabited by a different character of people;—if these are the facts recorded by the pen of History, does it not follow that climate has an immense influence on national character?

Those writers who deny the effect of physical causes on the character of nations, endeavour to account for the varieties of national character by attributing them to moral causes. It is not climate, say they,—it is the form of government; it is the principle of religion; it is the cultivation of the arts; it is the nature of education,—it is these that are the causes of the varieties of national character.

It must be admitted that each of these causes has an immense influence upon the character of mankind. It should be recollected that, while we contend for the influence of climate, we do not deny the influence of other circumstances. We do not contend that climate is the sole cause of all the varieties of national character; we contend only that it is one cause. There are many other causes. Sometimes these various causes act in conjunction in producing the same effect; at other times they act in opposition to each other, and control each other's influences. An effect produced by various causes will, of course, be more powerful than an effect produced by any one cause; and if several causes are united in acting in opposition to one cause, the influence of that one cause may be effectually controlled. Thus the effect of climate will, of course, be more obvious where the political institutions,

the religious principles, and the nature of education, act in accordance with it; but when these circumstances are adapted to control the influence of climate, its effects will be less powerful.

But may not some of these causes be themselves, in some instances at least, the effect of climate? Is it not the language of History, that free political institutions, as well as the more simple forms of religion, have uniformly taken up their habitations in cold countries?

If we trace the progress of political liberty, we shall find that it has usually been found in those countries which have a comparatively cold climate. The whole of the northern parts of Europe and Asia, as far as we have any account of them, appear from the earliest ages to have been in possession of political liberty. The Scythians, the Goths, the Huns, and the Tartars, appear in this respect to be very similar, and to resemble very much the ancient Germans and the Saxons. Among these nations, civil government appears to have been established merely for the purposes of war. In times of peace their chiefs had scarcely any power;—the whole tribe assembled to deliberate upon affairs of state. When war had been declared, no one was compelled to fight;—a chief was appointed, and those who chose to follow him were allowed to do so, receiving as their only pay a share of the plunder they might take from the enemy.

If, on the contrary, we view the southern regions, we shall find that throughout Asia there was not a republic. Despotism was the only form of government. Upon the chief ruler there was no constitutional, though there might in some cases be a virtual check, by the influence of the army or the priesthood. It is true these people were more advanced in civilization than the inhabitants of the north; but they possessed none of their bravery, or their desire of liberty. The republics of Greece, of Rome, and of Carthage will be considered as exceptions to this rule. But at this time the climate of Italy was cold; Greece, seated among mountains, might not have been excessively hot; and Carthage must have had its temperature moderated by the breezes of the Mediterranean Sea. But be this as it may, each of these

nations was, for a time, under a despotic government; and it was owing to a variety of extraordinary circumstances that they happened to become republics.

If we pass over to America, we shall make similar observations. The American Indians, who possessed all the wildness and liberty of unrestrained freedom, were found either in islands or in the northern parts of the continent, while the more polished but enslaved empires of Mexico and Peru were seated in the torrid zone.

We may observe, too, that the northern nations have in all ages been distinguished by the simplicity of their modes of worship. The different Pagan nations, of all climates, are distinguished from each other by the difference of their religious ceremonies, and the different degrees of power they gave their priests, rather than by any difference in the doctrines they believed. Indeed, the priests seldom troubled the minds of the people about points of faith; religion was, with them, altogether a matter of external observances.

In Egypt, the parent of the sciences, the priests, from the earliest ages, possessed immense power. Both the monarch and the people were held in subjection to the sacerdotal order. Many of the laws originated with them. At Babylon the priests appear to have had somewhat less power, and to have been in subjection to the monarch. But in both these places, and throughout the whole of the south, the Pagan worship was distinguished by the most costly ceremonies and the most splendid temples. The buildings consecrated to the deities form by far the most extensive remains of ancient architecture.

But among the northern tribes, the number of religious ceremonies was much less, and the influence of the priesthood was not so great. They had fewer temples, even in proportion to their wealth, than the southern nations.

There are, however, several exceptions to this observation. The Persians, who lived in the south and warm climate, adopted the religious principles of Zoroaster, whose system of faith was far less superstitious than that of the other priests of antiquity. Zoroaster taught the unity of God; he proscribed all idols, and taught that fire alone ought to be

worshipped as the only proper representative of the Supreme Being. After the Babylonians had been conquered, the Persians extended their religious faith. In many of their subsequent insurrections they provoked the Persians, who, to punish them, destroyed their idols. One of the Persians, on his conquest of Egypt, is said to have put to death the Egyptian god Apis. Another exception is in the case of the Druids, who exercised a most despotic dominion over the ancient Germans, and others who inhabited a cold climate.

If we pass into America, our observations will be found almost universally correct. The empires of Mexico and Peru are distinguished by their superstitious and splendid ceremonies, and the former for the cruel practice of offering human sacrifices; but the Indians were remarkable for the simplicity of their faith and worship.

There are two vices which seem to arise directly from the climate, independent of other circumstances.

In all northern and cold climates the people are addicted to drunkenness. Montesquieu goes so far as to say that the degrees of latitude may be drawn upon the globe by the degrees of drunkenness. The Russians, the Danes, and the Swedes are all given to the excessive use of strong liquors; while the French, the Spaniards, and the Italians are remarkable for their sobriety.

In all southern climates polygamy prevails. This was the case with the ancient as it is with the modern Orientals. Solomon had a thousand wives; and several of the Grand Seigniors of Turkey have had an equal number. Polygamy appears to have been as ancient as the time of Abraham. All Eastern legislators have permitted it. Moses permitted it to the Jews for the hardness of their hearts; which showed that in his time it had become interwoven with the manners of the people. Mahomet, though he proscribed the use of wine, allowed each man to have four wives. We are not to suppose, however, that because each man was permitted to marry four wives, therefore each man actually married four, as the climate must have produced the same effect upon one sex as upon the other. Polygamy was not necessary, but

was an act of tyranny on the part of the stronger sex; it was not necessary, though accidentally, the effect of the climate.

Notwithstanding I maintain that there is abundant evidence to prove the influence of climate upon the character of man, yet I am not disposed to deny that this opinion has been assailed by numerous and powerful objections. A celebrated writer has advanced almost every argument that can be produced upon the subject. I shall adduce an abridgment of his remarks. Both his facts and his observations are worthy of considerable attention. He thus accounts for varieties in national character:—

"1. Where a very extensive government has been established for many centuries, it spreads a national character over the whole empire, and communicates to every part a similarity of manners.

"Thus the Chinese have the greatest uniformity of character imaginable, though the air and climate of the different provinces are very different.

"2. In small governments which are contiguous, the people have, notwithstanding, a different character.

"Athens and Thebes were but a short day's journey from each other, though the Athenians were as remarkable for their ingenuity, politeness, and gaiety, as the Thebans for dulness, rusticity, and a phlegmatic temper.

"3. The same national manners commonly follow the authority of government to a precise boundary; and upon crossing a river or passing a mountain, one finds a new set of manners.

"The Languedocians and Gascons are the gayest people in France; but whenever you cross the Pyrenees, you are among Spaniards.

"4. Where any set of men, scattered over distant nations, maintain a close society or communication together, they acquire a similarity of manners.

"The Jews in Europe and the Armenians in the East have a peculiar character. The Jesuits, in all Roman Catholic countries, are also observed to have a character peculiar to themselves.

"5. Wherever any circumstance keeps two nations inhabiting the same country from mixing with each other, they will be distinguished by an opposite set of manners.

"Thus the Turks and the Greeks are of different characters.

"6. The same set of manners will follow a nation all over the globe, however different the climates.

"The Spanish, English, French, and Dutch colonies are all distinguished from each other even between the tropics.

"7. The manners of a people change very considerably from one age to another.

"The character of the ancient Greeks is very different from that of the modern. Candour, bravery, and love of liberty formed the character of the ancient Romans, as subtlety, cowardice, and a slavish disposition does that of the modern. The old Spaniards were restless, turbulent, and so addicted to war, that many of them killed themselves when deprived of their arms by the Romans. This character does not belong to the modern Spaniards, The ancient Batavians were very different from the modern Dutch. The ancient Gauls bore but a slight resemblance to the modern French; and a very considerable change has taken place since the days of Julius Cæsar in the character of the inhabitants of our own country.

"8. Where several neighbouring nations have a very close communication together, either by policy, commerce, or travelling, they acquire a similitude of manners proportioned to the communication.

"Thus all the Franks appear to have a uniform character to the Eastern nations.

"9. We may often remark a wonderful mixture of manners and characters in the same nation, speaking the same language, and subject to the same government.

"In this particular, the English are the most remarkable of any people that perhaps ever were in the world."

This elegant writer further observes, that "the French, the Greeks, the Egyptians, and the Persians are remarkable for gaiety; the Spaniards, the Turks, and the Chinese are noted for gravity and a serious deportment: and yet there is

no such difference of climate as to produce this difference of temper. The Greeks and Romans, who called all other nations barbarians, confined genius and a fine understanding to the more southern climates, and pronounced the northern nations incapable of all knowledge and civility; but our island has produced as great men, either for action or learning, as Greece or Italy has to boast of."

The substance of the arguments advanced by this writer amounts to this,—that the climate cannot influence the character, because nations of a different character are found in the same climate, and because nations of the same character are found in different climates. These would be arguments of considerable weight, if national character were influenced by no other circumstance. But while we know that national character is influenced by education, science, government, and religion, we may account for these varieties of character in the same climate without supposing that climate has actually no effect. We contend that the facts he has enumerated are the exceptions to the rule, produced by the causes he has assigned. Indeed, he has himself admitted the indirect effects of climate. He says:—

"There is some reason to think that all the nations which live beyond the polar circles, or between the tropics, are inferior to the rest of the species, and are incapable of all the higher attainments of the human mind. The poverty and misery of the northern inhabitants of the globe, and the indolence of the southern, from their few necessities, may perhaps account for this remarkable difference, without having recourse to physical causes." But how, we may ask, is this poverty in the northern parts of the world, and the abundance of the southern parts occasioned, but by the difference of climate?

Some of the arguments I advanced to prove the influence of climate are thus noticed:—

"Most conquests have gone from north to south; and it has hence been inferred that the northern nations possess a superior degree of courage and ferocity. But it would have been juster to have said that most conquests are made by

poverty and want upon plenty and riches. The Saracens, leaving the deserts of Arabia, carried their conquests northwards upon all the fertile provinces of the Roman empire, and met the Turks half-way, who were coming southward from the deserts of Tartary.

"The only observation with regard to the difference of men in different climates, in which we can rest any weight, is the common one—that people in the northern regions have a greater inclination to strong liquors, and those in the south to love and women. One can assign a very probable physical cause for this difference. Wine and distilled waters warm the frozen blood in the colder climates, and fortify men against the injuries of the weather, as the genial heat of the sun, in the countries exposed to his beams, inflames the blood, and excites the passion between the sexes. Perhaps, too, the matter may be accounted for on moral causes. All strong liquors are rare in the north, and, consequently, are more coveted. Diodorus Siculus tells us that the Gauls in his time were great drunkards, and much addicted to wine; chiefly, I suppose, from its rarity and novelty. On the other hand, the heat of the southern climates, obliging men and women to go half naked, thereby renders their frequent commerce more dangerous, and inflames their mutual passion. This makes parents and husbands more jealous and reserved, which still further inflames the passion.

"But, perhaps, the fact is doubtful that Nature has, either from moral or physical causes, distributed these respective inclinations to the different climates.

"The ancient Greeks, though born in a warm climate, seem to have been much addicted to the bottle; nor were their parties of pleasure anything but matches of drinking among men who passed their time altogether apart from the fair. Yet, when Alexander led the Greeks into Persia, —a still more southern climate,—they multiplied their debauches of this kind, in imitation of the Persian manners. So honourable was the character of a drunkard among the Persians, that Cyrus the younger, soliciting the sober Lacedæmonians for succour against his brother Artaxerxes, claims

it chiefly on account of his superior endowments, as more valorous, more bountiful, and a better drinker. Darius Hystaspes made it to be inscribed on his tombstone, among his other virtues and princely qualities, that no one could bear a greater quantity of liquor. You may obtain anything of the negroes by offering them strong drink, and may easily prevail with them to sell, not only their children, but their wives and mistresses, for a cask of brandy. In France and Italy, few drink pure wine, except in the greatest heats of summer; and, indeed, it is then almost as necessary, in order to recruit the spirits evaporated by heat, as it is in Sweden, during the winter, in order to warm the bodies congealed by the rigour of the season."

In adverting to these quotations I must here remark, that the influence of climate upon the human character has been distinguished into two kinds,—direct and indirect. The direct influence is when the sun operates immediately upon the body, and, by quickening the circulation of the blood, disposes the individual to particular passions. The indirect influence operates only by the use of means. Thus, if the coldness of the climate render the lands less fertile, and this comparative barrenness of the earth should render the people industrious, then is the industry of the people the indirect effect of the coldness of the climate. Some philosophers will admit the indirect effects of climate, without admitting its direct influence. Such appears to be the case with the writer I have quoted. For when he speaks of poverty produced by cold, and of fertility as the effect of heat, and this poverty and fertility producing corresponding effects upon the people, he certainly admits the indirect influence of climate. Indeed, from his last words, he appears unwittingly to admit the existence of the direct influence of climate. For what else can be meant when he speaks of the "spirits being evaporated by heat," and of "bodies congealed by the rigour of the season?"

It is obvious that the direct influence of climate is as capable of proof as the indirect. In Hindostan, women are mothers at ten years of age, and grandmothers at five-and-

twenty. What moral causes are adequate to the production of such an effect as this? It is clear that it is the direct effect of climate. The same climate which thus operates upon the functions of the body, inflames the passions of the mind. It is not love merely, but every other passion, that receives a strong stimulus. The inhabitants of southern climates have always been distinguished by similar passions: their love is ardent; their jealousy extreme; their sensibility is acute; and dreadful is their revenge. If, then, in the extremes of heat and cold, we can trace so distinctly the influence of the climate, it is fair to conclude that its influence is not less certain, though less obvious, in other countries remote from the extremes,—though in contiguous countries, whose climates do not much differ, it may not be so easy to perceive its effects.

Yet it is often the case, that in a country all of whose inhabitants speak the same language, are under the same government, and have the same religion, there is a marked difference between the northern and the southern provinces. This is the case with our own country. The Scots seem to have a great intellectual superiority. Even the inhabitants of Yorkshire appear generally to be better informed, and to have superior habits, than the people of the south. It is the same with the United States of America. New England is the Scotland of America. Its inhabitants are said to be far superior to those of the states in the south. In Spain, the natives of Biscay and Catalonia are much farther advanced than the people of the other provinces. A Catalonian would be offended were you to call him by the general name of Spaniard. He would exclaim, "Sir, I am a Catalonian!" The northern parts of Italy and of France are far superior to those of the south.

It has been objected, that if we believe that climate has such an influence upon human character, we must believe the materiality of the soul; for if climate produces these effects, the substance upon which it operates must be material. This, however, is quite an error. It is, indeed, true, that the substance upon which the climate operates

directly is material. The climate operates either upon the body of man, or upon the soil and circumstances around him; by these means the soul is affected, and certain faculties or affections are called into operation. In what way the soul is united to the body we know not; but we know the fact, and we know that a certain state of the body is associated with a state of feeling in the mind. A man whose body is sickly and feeble experiences a corresponding mental dejection. The drinking of strong liquors inflames the passions. It is the same with climate: in its direct influence, it operates on the body, and produces effects similar to those we daily witness and daily experience from change, in the temperature of the atmosphere; in its indirect influence, it merely presents occasions for the exercise of its mental faculties, or creates a necessity for their exertion.

But neither the direct nor the indirect influence of the climate can be produced as an argument in favour of the materiality of the soul. We can clearly perceive that the faculties and feelings of the soul cannot by any means be exercised by mere matter, nor can the properties of matter be applied to the mind.

We cannot form any idea of a thinking substance. That an atom of matter should be capable of thinking, comparing, reasoning, and judging; that two atoms of matter should be capable of love, of friendship, of conjugal and filial affection; that atoms of matter should frame themselves into society, should pass laws for their government, should cultivate the arts and sciences, and experience the emotions of patriotism, love of liberty, and universal benevolence; that atoms of matter should be capable of devout meditation and pious reverence for the Author of their existence; that faculties and feelings should be exercised by atoms of matter, —are associations revolting to the plainest dictates of common sense.

Besides, if the mind of man be matter, it must have the properties of matter; it must have length, and breadth, and thickness; it must occupy space, and possess density; it must be capable of being divided, or cut into a thousand

pieces. But who has ascertained these dimensions in reference to any one soul, or even to any part of a soul? Who can tell what is the length and breadth of a thought? Who can ascertain the rarity or denseness of a poetic imagination? Who can ascertain the solid contents of a man's conscience, or tell how many square yards are contained in his understanding? The very notions are absurd, and excite nothing but ridicule: it is obvious we are joining incongruous ideas.

The Philosophy of History has nothing to do with disquisitions of this kind. It is her province to notice events, to arrange facts, and to observe those deductions which they obviously suggest. She has collected evidence enough to prove that climate has an important effect upon human character; she appeals to facts to justify her assertions: but if you ask her how these effects can be produced, how can the wants or the emotions of the body operate upon the faculties or feelings of the mind?—instead of endeavouring to unravel a subject upon which the learning and ingenuity of ages have been lavished in vain, she bows with reverence and exclaims,—I do not know.

Before quitting the subject of climate, I may remark, that most of those articles which, in all ages, have been considered articles of luxury, are the growth of warm climates; it is from thence we import our silk, our cotton, our tea and sugar, our rice and tobacco. Mines of gold and silver are found chiefly in warm climates. India, Spain, and South America have been the principal seats of the precious metals. Most of our fragrant spices and aromatics, as well as a goodly portion of our drugs, are the production of the Oriental climes. In all ages these have been imported from the East. As the Arabians were the principal agents of the commerce that was carried on between the eastern and the western parts of the world, these spices were called the spices of Arabia; but they were not the growth of Arabia: they were produced in more eastern countries. The ancients had great need of these fragrant spices. With these they embalmed their dead; and these supplied the clouds of fragrance which

distinguished the religious worship of the Pagan deities. Silk, too, and purple dyes, were peculiarly valuable. A Roman emperor once refused to let his wife wear a silk dress because he could not afford it. Silk sold for its weight in gold.

Though the warm climates have thus supplied the other parts of the world with the enjoyments of life, they are often destructive to the inhabitants of their own regions. Warm climates are more subject to that dreadful scourge, the plague; earthquakes, too, break out frequently in warm climates. In these climates, the locusts (as in Hindostan) will sometimes consume all the produce of the field, and leave the people to perish with famine; nor are the mosquitoes, and other insects which torment the natives, unworthy of regard. Earthquakes, plagues, and locusts were among the evils denounced by the Hebrew prophets upon the rebellious and idolatrous Jews.

If the warm climates have the mines of gold and silver, the cold climates have mines of coal and iron,—a more useful metal. In cold climates, too, are the forests which supply us with wood, and the animals who give us our furs. Our flax and our hemp are chiefly the produce of a northern clime. Here we find the fish who supply us with food and with oil.

In the temperate zones the human character appears to the greatest advantage. Here intellect gains its full stature; here beauty flourishes for years, neither blighted by a northern, nor faded through an Oriental sun. Animals and vegetables, too, appear here to arrive at the highest state of perfection; here is produced the finest wool; and here our domestic animals have the greatest stature and strength. It is true the earth cannot produce the fruits nor the fragrance of the Oriental and southern climes; but this is abundantly compensated by the cultivation of the arts and the sciences, and the intellectual vigour they have imparted to the inhabitants.

I have thus glanced over the page of History, and have presented you with those principles which philosophers have maintained in reference to the influence of climate. In comparing the arguments which I have laid before you on

both sides of the question, you will probably find that the facts of history appear to bear conflicting testimony; ultimately, however, I think you will concur with me in believing that climate has a very important, though not an uncontrollable, influence in forming the character of nations.

But in the consideration of even physical causes, climate is not the only circumstance to be taken into consideration. The elevation of mountains, the fertility of the soil, the neighbourhood of rivers or of the sea,—these are subjects of considerable moment.

I shall now proceed to the consideration of mountains.

As the character of man is affected by a cold or a hot climate, so is it also affected by the features of the country in which he lives. Indeed it is obvious that if a cold climate produces a certain effect, a high mountain must produce a similar effect, because on the tops of mountains the climate is always cold. Some countries are completely mountainous; others are only intersected or surrounded with mountains; others are distinguished by widely-extended plains.

1. The inhabitants of mountainous districts are usually distinguished by industry and prudence.

As the tops and sides of mountains are usually cold and barren, it requires a larger portion of labour to raise from the soil the means of subsistence. The necessity for this labour is the cause of its application: the people thus acquire a habit of industry, by which they are distinguished in all their other undertakings. Mountains, too, are exposed to great severity of cold; to storms, to hurricanes, to long-continued snow and hail. To guard against the evils which these may occasion, requires foresight and precaution; and hence the natives acquire the habit of prudence. This character for prudent industry is so generally the character of mountaineers, that it is not necessary to refer to particular instances.

2. The inhabitants of mountainous districts are also distinguished by great simplicity of manners, and the absence of luxury.

A nation can acquire luxuries only by producing them from its own soil, or by obtaining them from other nations. If it procures its luxuries from other nations, it must give the produce of its own land or labour in exchange. A mountainous country is seldom in a state to do either of these. The land is too barren, and the climate too cold, for their production. The soil can produce only what is necessary for immediate subsistence. It cannot produce a sufficient quantity of other products to be parted with in exchange for luxuries. Hence we find all history has recorded that the inhabitants of mountains have been distinguished by simplicity of manners. And hence has arisen the amiable character ascribed to the people of Wales and of Switzerland.

3. If the mountains are capable of yielding sufficient herbage for the food of sheep, but, at the same time, the people have other more fertile lands which they can cultivate, that country will probably become a pastoral country. Such was the state of Judæa, whose mountains were the resort of sheep driven thither by the Israelitish shepherds. Such for many years has been the state of Spain. The herds of Spain are very numerous. The sheep are conducted in summer to the tops of mountains, and to the northern parts of the country, and are brought back in winter to the southern provinces. Twice in each year the flocks are made to traverse the whole extent of Spain. By privilege granted by the Government, the flocks have a right of pasture on all the lands over which they pass: if a person enclosed any land in this track, he must leave a road ninety yards wide for the use of the flocks. The Government has granted these privileges to the owners of sheep for the purpose of maintaining the high quality of Spanish wool. This object, perhaps, is obtained; but agriculture is ruined: the flocks in their progress, having a right of pasture, produce a general devastation. It has been calculated that five millions of sheep, with twenty-five thousand shepherds, and as many dogs, spread their ravages over the finest provinces of Spain twice every year: it is not surprising, therefore, that

the lands subject to this intrusion are not so well cultivated as those at a greater distance.

4. Mountains furnish places of natural defence against the attacks of an invader.

A man standing on an eminence has a great advantage when fighting against a man on the plain beneath. Hence a small army seated on a mountain is able to contend against a far more numerous army by whom it may be assailed. Among mountains, too, there are always difficult roads, and passes known only to the natives, or on which an army of strangers are peculiarly liable to surprise and defeat. An army of strangers, too, it may be observed, are not so well able to bear the climate as the natives. From these circumstances it is that mountains have, in all ages, been places of defence. One of the most striking instances of the utility of mountains for this purpose is related in the "History of Hindostan."

"The greatest part of Hindostan Proper consists of immense plains, watered, and a great part of them annually inundated by the Indus and the Ganges, or their auxiliary streams. From Hurdwar, in about thirty degrees north latitude, where the Ganges, bursting through the frontier mountains, enters the plains of Hindostan, the whole country is an uniform level, allowing a descent, imperceptible to the eye, of about nine inches per mile, through an extent of about eight hundred miles, in a direct line to the south-easternmost parts of Bengal. This extensive plain gradually widens from the frontier, and, in Bengal, expands to at least two hundred and fifty miles in breadth. The annual inundation in Bengal extends above a hundred miles in breadth, nothing appearing but villages and trees, excepting very rarely the top of an elevated spot; the artificial mound of some deserted village appearing like an island. To the west of Bengal the country is diversified, and, in some places, mountainous; the central province of Malway is the most elevated part of Hindostan. Agimere, including, among others, the provinces of Chertore and Cudipour, consists of high mountains divided by narrow valleys, or of plains environed by mountainous ridges, and

accessible only by narrow passes and defiles, being by nature one of the strongest countries in the world; its dimensions are adequate to the support of a numerous population, as, notwithstanding its mountainous aspect, it possesses a sufficient quantity of arable land, and enjoys a temperate climate, being situated between the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth degrees of latitude. The country of Agimere constitutes a phenomenon in the history of Hindostan. It has always been the celebrated seat of the Rajpoots,—the warrior tribe among the Hindoos, which is noticed by ancient writers; and the antiquity of the house of the Rana, their chief prince, may be traced from Ptolemy. This district, though situated so near to the centre of the Mogul government, and successfully attacked by the Gaznavide, Patan, and Mogul emperors, has never been more than nominally reduced to subjection. Every war undertaken against these people, even by the great Aurungzebe, ended in a compromise or defeat on the side of the assailants."

Numerous other examples are recorded on the page of History. In sacred history, we often read of David retiring to the strongholds, or resorting to the top of a rock. These strongholds, or rocks, were mountains, possessing the means of natural defence against the attacks of an enemy. Judæa being a mountainous country, probably contained many such places.

In Spain, the Romans had immense difficulty, both in subduing the natives, and in keeping them in subjection after they were subdued; scarcely a province of the Roman empire was more distinguished by revolts and insurrections. The reason is that, when the Spaniards were defeated, they took shelter in the mountains, where the Romans could not follow them: here they recovered their strength, watched their opportunity, and then sallied forth again. From the same cause, Spain was the seat of contest between the Gauls and the Moors for upwards of eight hundred years; and it was not till the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella that the Moors were completely subdued. In level countries, one or two grand battles usually decide the fate of the nation; but

here the beaten party could always take refuge in the mountains, to which the conqueror dare not follow up his victory. Even in their contest with Buonaparte, the Guerillas under General Mina displayed more heroism than any other portion of the Spanish nation.

When Julius Cæsar invaded Gaul, he found the Helvetians, that is to say, the Swiss, to be the bravest of his enemies. The mountainous character of this country enabled the inhabitants to resist the whole power of Austria; and though surrounded by some of the most powerful states of Europe, and often divided among themselves, they have still been able to maintain their independence.

During the middle ages, Scotland was repeatedly conquered by the English; but the conquest could not be maintained: the defeated party retired to the mountains, whither the English army could not follow them; and, watching their opportunity, they returned and drove out their conquerors.

The mountains of Wales were not subdued by the Romans; hither those spirits who would not submit to servitude took their flight. The Norman kings had immense difficulty in conquering Wales: nor was it, after all, a complete conquest; for the Welsh princes having been slain, and Edward the First having caused his wife to travel to Wales in a state of pregnancy, he presented them with a prince born in their own country; and they, expecting to be governed in a state of separation from England, came to terms of amity and friendship. In modern times the science of fortification has discovered additional means of defence. The Dutch defend themselves in a level country by means of canals, which at any time they can open, and place the whole country under water.

5. If a country be intersected by ridges of mountains, the spaces between these ridges will probably become the residence of separate and independent nations.

Mr. Addison remarks, in his Travels through Italy, that Italy appears to be formed by nature to be the residence of several distinct nations, as the mountains seem to parcel out

the country into such allotments as it has always been divided into by the inhabitants.

Previous to the time of the Romans, Italy was inhabited by several different tribes of nations. The Romans fought with each of these tribes; and, in the course of three hundred years, subdued them all. Italy was then under one government; but, upon the breaking up of the Roman empire, Italy fell into those pieces in which it is presented to us in modern history. The subdivison of Italy into so many petty states has been one cause of its present insignificance. If Charlemagne had united the whole of Italy under one government, and it had remained unbroken, it would at this time have been one of the principal powers of Europe. Possessed of its natural advantages—having so fertile a soil, such excellent ports, so fine a situation for commerce—it could not fail, if united under a vigorous government, of being a first-rate political power. But, by being divided into a number of petty states, each of which is jealous of the others, and the natives having become enervated from other causes, Italy has merely been the theatre on which France, Germany, and Spain have chosen to decide their quarrels; and each of the petty states has been the tool of one or other of these great powers.

Spain, too, is intersected with mountains; and hence it has become divided into provinces, which, in former times, were called kingdoms. At the time of the Romans, Spain contained many distinct tribes. For many centuries after it was conquered by the Goths, it was governed by a number of independent princes. At length the whole of these independent states were reduced to two, which were governed by Ferdinand and Isabella. The marriage of these two parties united all the provinces; and Charles the Fifth was the first sole monarch of Spain. The title of kingdom is still given to some of the larger provinces—as the kingdom of Aragon, the kingdom of Andalusia.

6. The inhabitants of mountainous countries are said to be distinguished by an ardent love for their country.

The Highlanders of Scotland have, in former times, been

brought to fight against the English; but they never advanced far beyond the limits of their own country—they were anxious to return to their native mountains.

The Swiss are remarkable for their love of country. When, according to the barbarous customs of those republics, the Swiss soldiers have been let out to fight some distant battles, it has often been necessary to forbid the soldiers to sing their national song, lest it should inspire them with a desire to return home.

The love of country appears to be more ardent among the members of small states than large ones. Perhaps, too, mountain scenery may give the mind a romantic turn, and strengthen all those feelings that depend upon association. Mountains, too, exhibit splendid objects, which cannot fail to rivet the mind; and, after a residence among these sublime exhibitions of nature, the flat and confined scenery of the plains cannot fail to appear insipid.

We must, however, distinguish between the actual inhabitant of the mountains and the mere native of a mountainous country. The Swiss, whose whole country is mountainous, feel an attachment to their native country; but I am not aware that the Italians and the Spaniards,—at least those of them who live in cities,—are remarkable for this virtue.

We must observe, too, that in all mountainous countries, the valleys are extremely hot, in consequence of the reflection of the sunbeams from the sides of the mountains. Persia is a country intersected with mountains; yet, in the southern provinces, the heat is so oppressive that, in summer time, the Persians leave their habitations and retire to the mountains. We must not wonder, therefore, that the inhabitants of different parts of the same country should exhibit different traits of character.

I will also remark that, although with us there is no vast difference between the temperature of the days and the nights, yet, in the southern climates, the days are often intensely hot, and the nights intensely cold. In those countries the sun is almost vertical; consequently, his rays are oppressive: and, as the days and nights are always of nearly equal

length, the length of the night renders it intensely cold. Jacob said to Laban, "By day the heat consumed me, and the cold by night."

7. Mountainous nations have generally been governed by a republican form of government.

Switzerland contains thirteen states, perfectly independent of each other, each of which is governed by a republic; nor at any period of their history has any state manifested an inclination to adopt a different form of government. Both ancient and modern Italy were divided into a vast number of republics, which continued till the French Revolution. There was no king in modern Italy until the allies, who fought against Louis XIV., made the Duke of Savoy king of Sardinia, as a reward for his joining the confederacy against that monarch.

The coldness of the climate, and the wildness of the scenery, is said to inspire the inhabitants of mountains with the love of liberty; and this induces them to adopt a republican form of government. Besides, the states formed in mountainous countries are usually small; and all the little states which history has brought to our notice have had this form of government. If, indeed, they have at any time given to their chief magistrate the title of king, he has usually had but a very limited authority. A republic is not adapted for an extensive or a wealthy state.

8. The inhabitants of mountains are peculiarly addicted to superstitious observances.

I have said that mountains give a sort of romantic character to the feelings of the inhabitants. It seems natural to man to associate ideas of sanctity with those objects which excite his admiration. Hence, in every age, mountains have been regarded as objects of veneration. They have been supposed to be the seats of the gods, or of the muses; and to be places peculiarly adapted for the celebration of religious rites. Another cause may be assigned for this circumstance; it is probable that the first species of idolatry introduced after the Deluge, was the worship of the heavenly bodies; and hence the devotees resorted to mountains to witness their rising the

sooner. On the rise of a new moon, the people flocked to the mountains, and held an evening festival in honour of the queen of heaven.

But whatever may have been the cause, history records the numerous facts as to the sanctity attributed to mountains. The Jewish people were frequently reproved for burning incense, and offering sacrifice in high places; that is, on mountains sacred to their idols.

The Greeks attributed sanctity to several of their mountains, and especially to Olympus, which was supposed to be the residence of Jupiter. At the present day, Mount Athos is covered with monasteries and hermitages. The mountain called Montserrat, in Spain, is of a similar form, and is also distinguished by a famous monastery. These places are annually resorted to by numerous bands of pilgrims.

As mountains have thus, in all ages, been regarded as sacred objects, it would, of course, be expected that the mountaineers themselves shared in the general impression. In the legends of the different orders of the priesthood, every striking object in nature has been made the scene of some celestial visitation. Hence the mountains have been, either occasionally or constantly, peopled with angels or saints; and the inhabitants ever had before their eyes some spot favoured with the presence of the Divinity.

"Upon the summit of mountains, the Jews, the Persians, the Bithynians, the infidel nations round Palestine, and the Druids of Gaul, Britain, and Germany, were accustomed to sacrifice. The Celts conceived that the spirits of their heroes resided among the clefts of the rocks, and on the tops and sides of the mountains; the natives of Greenland believed them to be the immediate residence of their deities. The Laplanders imagine that the mountains are inhabited by spirits who are endowed with power to influence human actions."

The most extensive plains in the world are those of Egypt, Babylon, Hindostan, China, Arabia, and Tartary. Egypt and Babylon were the parents of the arts; Hindostan and China were early favoured with the blessings of civilization;

Arabia has been but half civilized; and Tartary has always maintained its barbarism. On the other hand, Egypt, Babylon, Hindostan, and China, have, in all ages, been the seats of despotic powers; while Arabia and Tartary have been distinguished by freedom. The character of a country has an important influence upon the nature of its military defence. Egypt, being an uninterrupted plain, was distinguished by the number of its chariots and horsemen: such also appears to have been the case with Babylon. Arabia and Tartary abound in horses, and their soldiers are all cavalry; while in Judæa, which was a mountainous country, Moses prohibited the use of horses: for riding they employed asses or mules; and for the purposes of husbandry they employed oxen. Horses are of little use in defending a mountainous country.

The next circumstance that ought to be classed among the physical causes of the varieties of national character is the barrenness or fertility of the soil.

Wherever the soil is remarkably fertile, the mass of the people are engaged in agriculture; hence, the inhabitants must be scattered over the surface of the country. No large body can easily, and at a short time, assemble together. This want of intercourse occasions a simplicity, and also a rusticity of manners. It presents an obstacle to the formation of plans of insurrection against the government, and it occasions obsequiousness on the part of the cultivators towards the owners of the soil; the want of intercourse with better-informed persons makes them content with their own attainments, renders them obstinate and self-willed, and, at the same time, deprives them of the means of improving their knowledge; and as their crops depend upon the weather, which is always uncertain, they, like sailors and all other persons engaged in uncertain occupations, become credulous and superstitious.

Where land, too, is exceedingly fertile, a larger share goes to the landlord for rent. Rent is the difference of produce between the least fertile and the most fertile land in cultivation. In all countries there is some land which merely

pays the expense of cultivation; the difference between this and other lands will be greater in proportion as the other lands are more fertile. Hence, as fertile countries become thickly populated, the rent of the landlords becomes enormous. Thus the landlords, who form but a small portion of the community, get immensely rich, and are able to domineer over the other classes. If the proprietor cultivate his land himself, as is the case in all countries which are but imperfectly civilized, he is able, in proportion to its fertility, to maintain a greater number of vassals.

These observations will perhaps enable us to account for the facts that, in the most fertile countries, the political institutions have been friendly to despotism, while those of the more barren countries have been friendly to liberty.

"The barrenness of the Attic soil," says Montesquieu, "established there a popular government, and the fertility of that of Lacedæmon, an aristocratic form of government; for in those times Greece was averse to the government of a single person, and aristocracy had the nearest resemblance to that form of government.

"Plutarch says, that the Cilonian sedition having been appeased at Athens, the city fell into its ancient dissensions, and was divided into as many parties as there were kinds of territory in Attica. The men who inhabited the eminences would, by all means, have a popular government; those of the plain demanded a government composed of the chiefs; and they who were near the sea were for a government made up of both."

In a country where the lands is very fertile, the people may become numerous. The facility of obtaining food for their children is an inducement to marriage, and hence population is increased. Wages will probably be low, as they are regulated by the price of provisions. And as a small portion of the population will be able to raise food enough for the whole community, there will be a greater number of what Sir James Stuart calls free hands,—that is, of labourers to be employed in other pursuits than that of the production of food. If the nation should be without foreign

trade, these people must be employed either in manufactures, in building, or in war, or they will remain idle. This cheapness of labour, and the necessity of finding employment for the people, was perhaps the cause of the erection of those stupendous works of architecture which were erected by the ancients. The temples at Nineveh and Babylon, the sacred buildings at Hindostan, and the lofty pyramids of Egypt, were not, perhaps, raised at any great pecuniary expense. They were all the result of labour; and in a state of peace, when soldiers were not wanted for the wars, the price of labour must have been exceedingly low. A similar cause might have produced those cathedrals and churches of our own country. It is a singular fact, that these elegant buildings were erected at a time when the main body of the people were in a state of brutish ignorance, and when England possessed no proportion of the wealth she now enjoys: but England was then exclusively agricultural—labour must have been exceedingly cheap; and as all the national resources were directly or indirectly under the influence of the clergy, some of whom had travelled into Italy, and were men of taste and learning, the erection of these structures excites but little surprise.

The buildings of Greece and Rome were not the result of similar circumstances,—they were the effect of wealth and increased civilization among the people. Rome got her wealth by plunder; Athens, hers, in part, by commerce. Their elegant and extended buildings are a standing memorial of their taste, their luxury, and their wealth.

It is principally by producing barrenness in a country that the cold climates and the high mountains affect the character of the people. In cold climates the land is not so fertile as in hot climates, and mountains are less fertile than plains. "The barrenness of the earth," says Montesquieu, "renders men industrious, sober, inured to hardship, and fit for war: they are obliged to procure by labour what the earth refuses to bestow spontaneously. The fertility of a country gives ease, effeminacy, and a certain fondness for the preservation of life. It has been remarked that the German

troops raised in those places where the peasants are rich—as, for instance, in Saxony—are not so good as the others."

Wherever the lands are very fertile, the people are lazy. In most cases, where a man can obtain the means of subsistence by a certain portion of labour, he will labour no more. "No man," says Dr. Johnson, "loves labour for its own sake." He might have added, that few are disposed to labour to procure superfluous enjoyments. The Turks, who inhabit some of the finest countries in the world, are indolent in the extreme; so, also, are the inhabitants of the fertile plains of South America. Much of this is, no doubt, owing to the direct influence of the climate; but the direct influence of the climate would not produce this effect to such a degree did it not also increase the fertility of the earth. Thus climate operates in two ways; it increases the disposition to be indolent, and it diminishes the necessity of being industrious.

The Arabs, who inhabit a hot climate, are, nevertheless, remarkable for their activity; the reason is, they have no fertile lands. They lead a wandering life, and conduct their flocks from one fertile spot to another, in search of pasture; they plunder the travellers, and seek a refuge in the desert. Here the barrenness of the soil appears, in a great measure, to have counteracted the influence of climate.

The same observation will apply to the negroes of Africa: while the natives of Hindostan, and the Indians of South America, have their strength dried up by the heat of the sun, and are ready to bury themselves in the earth, to seek a shelter from his rays, the negro, who inhabits a much hotter climate, is strong and athletic, and can vie in energy with the Europeans. But then the negro has to roam through deserts; he has no fertile earth to cultivate: and hence, exertion is necessary to procure the means of subsistence. The direct influence of climate is here, too, counteracted by the barrenness of the soil.

Where the lands are very fertile, we often find that a great number of holidays and other religious festivals are established.

In ancient times, the interval between seed-time and harvest must have been a season of repose. The Romans employed this time in making inroads into the territories of their neighbours, and in carrying off their property or their daughters; but, as they advanced in civilization, they found employment for their leisure time in celebrating festivals in honour of their gods. In proportion as civilization advances among Pagan nations, in such proportion do they increase the number of their deities; and they have a proportionally greater number of festivals to observe. Men who are engaged in agriculture,—who are dependent on the sun, the wind, and the rain,—would always be in need of some favour of the gods; and, as each kind of weather, and even each kind of vegetable production, had its presiding deity, a Pagan agriculturist must have been a pretty constant attendant at the temples of his favourite gods: and as in very fertile regions the farmers must have had more time to spare, their religious observances would be more abundant. This may have been one cause why Babylon and Egypt became so proverbial for their idolatry.

In a purely agricultural country, these numerous holidays may have been productive of less evil than they would produce in a commercial country. The numerous saints' days which are observed in Catholic countries were not, perhaps, ill-adapted to the state of Europe during the Middle Ages, however pernicious they would be now Europe has changed its character and become commercial. I must observe, too, that the state of agriculture is changed now from what it was then; agricultural industry is now distributed so as to furnish employment to the labourers regularly throughout the year.

The next circumstance that will come under consideration, in the Philosophy of Geographical History, is the influence of rivers, and of the vicinity of the sea.

Europe has three of its sides washed by the sea: the Baltic and the Mediterranean seas penetrate far into its interior; it has also many large navigable rivers. Africa, though almost

surrounded by the sea, has but few harbours, and no bays, or arms of the sea, branching into the interior of the continent; its rivers are but few, and these are comparatively unknown. The southern part of Asia is, like Europe, intersected with gulfs and bays, and has also numerous large navigable rivers.

The history of these several countries seems to justify the adoption of the following principles:—

The possession of rivers, and the vicinity of the sea, give greater fertility to the soil; the vapours drawn up from the sea are poured down again upon the land in its neighbourhood. The fertility of ancient Egypt was proverbial; and it was, for many ages, the granary of Rome. This was produced by the overflowing of the Nile, occasioned by the heavy rains of the vernal equinox. During August and September, the land was wholly under water; numerous canals were formed, so that they served the purpose of roads, in the same way that they now do in Holland. In Asia, the larger rivers,—the Ganges, the Tigris, and the Euphrates,—overflow their banks sometimes to a distance of a hundred miles, and thus give additional richness and fertility to the soil.

Rivers and seas supply the means of carrying on trade and commerce. Commerce is nothing more than the exchange of one commodity for another; but bulky commodities cannot be removed to a great distance by land-carriage, unless at a great expense: by means of water-carriage this expense is considerably diminished, and commerce is facilitated. History does not present us with an account of any great commercial nation which was not, at the same time, a maritime nation; unless the Arabians, indeed, who were the means, in ancient times, of carrying on the commerce that existed between India and Europe, are to be deemed a commercial nation. Egypt, and Tyre, and Carthage, and the colonies of Athens, were all seated on the borders of the Mediterranean Sea; there, too, in the middle ages, were the commercial republics of Venice and Genoa, of Florence and Pisa. The Hanse Towns were established on the coasts of the Baltic; and the numerous rivers of the Netherlands caused it to be the seat of the woollen manufacture in the middle ages. The trade

which has been carried on by Portugal, Holland, and England, and other European Powers, to the East Indies, has usually been in proportion to the strength of their navies: but China, and India, and Babylon were not, in ancient times, remarkable as commercial nations; nor was Egypt, except at a later period of her history. An extensive country, whose provinces lie in different climates, may possess all the means of wealth, and even of luxury, without any commerce with foreign nations. Let a province become independent, and have a separate government, and what was before a home trade now becomes a foreign one. It is by the exchange of the productions of different soils, and of different climates, that wealth and luxury are increased; and whether the countries which make this exchange are under the same, or under different governments, the advantage is the same. The numerous canals that existed in the countries we have mentioned is a proof that their internal trade must have been great.

The frequent intercourse which is thus facilitated by rivers and by seas, and which receives a farther stimulus by commerce, necessarily leads to the civilization of the people.

Mankind are civilized by association. Hence it is that the inhabitants of towns and cities are more intellectual and refined than those who reside in the country. Egypt, Nineveh, Hindostan, and China are remarkable for their early civilization; from Egypt the arts were communicated to Greece, and to the inhabitants of all the coasts of the Mediterranean Sea. But while civilization thus early found a habitation in those countries which were intersected by bays or rivers, and which were adjacent to the sea, the countries which were without these advantages have remained, from age to age, in the same state of barbarism. Such is the case with all the countries in the north of Asia and of Europe; and such is the case with the interior of Africa.

The banks of rivers, or the coasts of the sea, are usually the seats of the largest cities and towns. When a new settlement is made in any country, the colonists begin, in the first instance, to cultivate the lands nearest to the sea or to a river; here they can most easily receive supplies from the

mother country, and can also most readily export the commodities they give in exchange. Such was the conduct of those Englishmen who colonized North America. The position of most of the renowned cities of ancient times was also on the banks of rivers, or on the coast of the sea; the cities of Egypt were all on the banks of the Nile; Nineveh was seated on the Tigris, and Babylon on the Euphrates; Rome was on the banks of the Tiber, and Athens was within two miles of the sea, with fortified walls passing from the city to the coast; Carthage and Tyre were on the shores of the Mediterranean. At the present day, with only one exception, the capital city of every country in Europe is seated upon a river; that exception is Madrid, the capital of a country that seems destined to form an exception to all general rules. If the river takes its rise in the country, the capital city ought to be fixed at that place where the river ceases to be navigable for large vessels. If it be seated lower down the river, it will be more liable to an attack from a hostile fleet; if it be built higher up the river, the large ships will not be able to reach it. In this respect, London is most advantageously situated. Had it been founded nearer the sea, we should be more exposed in time of war to the insults of the enemy; the bridges thrown across the river would prevent the large ships passing farther up, and hence a great part of the advantage of the river would have been lost. Had it been seated higher up the river, the large ships could not reach it; the goods imported must first have been taken from the ship into barges or boats; these would have taken them farther up the river, and then unloaded. Thus every article would have had to bear the expense of a double unloading: the price of these commodities would, of course, be advanced; and the additional expense would fall upon the consumer; the price of living in London would, consequently, be increased, and fewer persons would be disposed to make it their residence.

The city of Paris is, in respect to foreign commerce, most disadvantageously situated; it is placed too far up the river, and is, therefore, subject to the inconveniences I have just

described. The Seine is navigable for large ships only to Rouen. If, some ages ago, this city had been made the capital of France, perhaps it would, at this time, have been equal to London. But, perhaps, it is not desirable that a capital should be so near the sea. The city of Albany has recently been made the capital of the state of New York, instead of the city of New York; Albany is a hundred miles up the river.

Not only the capital city, but nearly all the large towns, have, both in ancient and in modern times, been seated on the banks of rivers. The best way of studying the topography of any country is to trace the course of its rivers upon a map, and you will be sure to discover all the principal towns. This observation is of so general an application, that to enumerate instances would be tedious and unnecessary.

Among the celebrated cities of antiquity which were not thus situated, are the cities of Jerusalem and of Palmyra. Jerusalem, like several of the towns of Palestine, was seated on a mountain, and was supplied with water, either by natural fountains, or by the rain received during the rainy season in cisterns provided for that purpose. The city of Palmyra was seated in the deserts of Arabia, upon a fertile spot that appeared like an island seated in an ocean of sand; it has been supposed that this was the city founded by Solomon, and which was called Tadmor in the Desert. Through the facilities this city presented to the carrying on the lucrative trade to India, Palmyra became immensely rich. It rebelled against the Roman power, and was destroyed by Aurelian: it is now celebrated for its ruins. This was the city of Longinus, famed for his literary works.

Rivers are often the boundary-line both between provinces and nations: several of the counties of England, and several of the provinces of France, are bounded by rivers. Nations whose habits are very dissimilar from each other, are often separated only by a river. On one side of the Red Sea are situated the Abyssinians,—an Arabian race of a character completely different from the Egyptians who are on the opposite shore: the Gulf of Bassora divides the Bassora and

the Arabs, and the Gulf of Siam lies between the Malays and the people of Cambodia; the boundary of the Roman empire on the north was the Rhine and the Danube, and, on the east, the river Euphrates.

Those countries the inhabitants of which have been chiefly devoted to maritime affairs, have usually had a republican form of government; hence Carthage and Tyre, Venice and Genoa, Holland and the Hanse Towns, were all governed by republics.

As an island possesses a larger extent of sea-coast, in proportion to its size, than any country forming part of a continent, our observations will apply to them, more strictly, perhaps, than to those countries we have named. "The people of the isles," says Montesquieu, "have a higher relish for liberty than those of the continent. Islands are, commonly, of small extent; one part of the people cannot so easily be employed to oppress the other; the sea separates them from great empires, so that they cannot be invaded by tyranny. Conquerors are stopped by the sea; the islanders themselves are not involved in conquests, and more easily preserve their laws."

The islands of which we read in ancient history are principally those of the Mediterranean Sea, and were colonized by emigrations from Athens. They adopted the republican form of government, and carried on a commercial intercourse with the parent state, but were perfectly independent in regard to authority.

The last objects to which I shall allude, as connected with Geographical History, are forests and mines.

"The forests of Caledonia and Hercynia are important objects in ancient history. The first was a celebrated retreat of the ancient Picts and Scots; the latter anciently occupied the greatest part of Europe, particularly Germany, Poland, Hungary, &c. In Cæsar's time it extended from the borders of Alsatia and Switzerland to Transylvania, and was computed sixty days' journey long, and nine broad."—*Encyclopædia Britannica.*

Forests, like mountains, present the means of resisting an invading army. It was by means of their forests that the Germans were enabled to arrest the progress of the Romans, and, for several ages, to keep their legions on the frontiers in constant alarm. In the American war, our soldiers were exposed to much annoyance from the attacks made upon them in marching through the forests.

Forests are the means of supplying the natives with abundance of fuel, and with materials for building their houses; hence, in a country remarkable for forests, the houses of the inhabitants will be built chiefly of wood; and the burning of wood only for fuel will not obscure the purity of the atmosphere. In Egypt, and generally throughout the East, fuel was very scarce: they have neither forests nor coal-mines. In those climates, however, fuel was not a matter of so much importance; their food was chiefly of a vegetable kind, that required but little fire for its cooking.

It has already been observed that the clearing of woods improves the warmth of the atmosphere. Such has been the case in France and Germany, in America, and in some of the West India Islands.

In proportion as society advances in civilization, and becomes more wealthy, the extent of forests will be diminished, the price of wood and of cattle will be advanced, and the price of corn will fall.

The most extensive forests in modern Europe are those of Norway; from whence is imported a large quantity of timber annually into Great Britain. There are no forests in Scotland at present. Tourists have regretted the want of wood in Scottish scenery. The forests of England have gradually diminished: most of them appear to have been formed for the purpose of affording the means of hunting. Forests are the common resorts of wild, and, in some countries, of ferocious animals.

The country most eminent for mines, in the ancient world, was Spain. From this country it was that the Carthaginians, and, after them, the Romans, procured the precious metals. The Carthaginians are also said to have visited our country,

and obtained tin from the mines of Cornwall. Tin and copper appear to have been the metals with which the ancients first became acquainted; their weapons of war were, for a considerable period, made of brass. Historians are puzzled to ascertain from whence the precious metals possessed by Egypt, Babylon, and the more ancient nations, were obtained.

The possession of mines of gold and silver must tend to enrich a country, as with these metals she can purchase those commodities she wants of other nations. It has been contended that the possession of the American mines has been the cause of the decline of Spain; but what foundation is there for this opinion? It is said that the people who obtained gold would no longer work; but the adventurers who went to America would return and spend their money in Spain; and this would encourage trade and production. Do not many Englishmen go to the East Indies, and return with ample fortunes; but how can this cause the nation to decline? A great part of the gold imported into Spain ultimately found its way into England; why did it not cause England to decline? It may be said that England received the gold in exchange for her manufactures, but Spain obtained her gold for nothing: this, however, is not correct, in reference to the country at large. The number of the Spanish adventurers was small in comparison to the whole nation; and the body of the people could obtain the gold only in exchange for other commodities. The sums received by the Government rendered taxes less necessary; but how can diminished taxation cause a nation to decline? It was not the South American colonies that caused Spain to decline; it was the conduct of the Government at home; it was the expulsion of the Moors and the Jews; it was the taxes laid upon manufactures and commerce; it was the vast portions of land held in mortmain by religious corporations; it was the great numbers of people withdrawn from the paths of industry and enclosed in monasteries; it was the imprudent and destructive wars carried on against Holland, England, and France; and it was the civil and ecclesiastical tyranny

by which she was enslaved;—it was these, and not the South American mines, that caused the decline of Spain.

A nation that has extensive mines of coal and iron will, probably, become a manufacturing country: these are commodities that cannot be carried, in their natural state, to any very distant place, but at a great expense; it is necessary that the manufactured articles should be made on the spot where the materials are found. It is to her extensive coal-mines in Northumberland, and to her coal and iron mines in Staffordshire. Shropshire, and Wales, that England is mainly indebted for her manufacturing greatness. Sweden, Russia, Germany, and the north of France have also mines of this description; and, in some of these countries, the iron is superior to that of England. This superiority is owing, probably, to their forests, in consequence of which the iron is extracted from the stone by means of charcoal instead of coke.

It is a remark which, I apprehend, will generally be found to be true, that those labourers who are employed in mining, though they get higher wages than others, yet are more improvident. They are exposed to great dangers in regard to their lives, and, like soldiers and gamblers, they attach ideas of uncertainty to everything which is future; hence they are unwilling to deny themselves a gratification which is present and certain, in order to make provision for one which is future and contingent.

It may be a subject of inquiry, whether mining does not nourish among the people a spirit of gambling. It is an enterprise which is always attended with a degree of uncertainty: hence it is, that mining is usually conducted by companies; an individual takes a share in a mine with the same feelings that he buys a ticket in the lottery; it is entirely a speculation; and his success depends upon fortune. This observation applies more particularly to mines of gold, silver, and copper; coal-mines are not so subject to this uncertainty.

I have thus noticed the physical causes which have an influence upon the character of nations. I have considered

the varieties of climate; the effects of mountains and of rivers, of the fertility of the soil, of forests and of mines.

At a time like the present, when new lands are discovered, and when new colonies are established, these inquiries cannot be deemed uninteresting or unprofitable. In making a new settlement in any country, the first thing that ought to be considered is its natural advantages; we should inquire into the nature of the climate, into the fertility of the soil, the facilities it may possess for water-carriage, and all the other circumstances connected with its geographical and topographical situation; for although it is true that the institutions of society may be of so pernicious a character as to counteract the effect of the most valuable gifts of nature, yet, in looking over the map of the world, we may venture to predict that the future prosperity of the infant establishments now forming in the new world will, *cœteris paribus*, be in proportion to their natural advantages.

LECTURE II.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF DOMESTIC HISTORY.

In my last Lecture I considered the Philosophy of Geographical History. We took a rapid glance at those events which History has recorded in reference to the geographical circumstances of our globe, and considered those principles which the events appeared to suggest.

In the present Lecture I shall consider the Philosophy of Domestic History. It will be necessary for us to take a view of those facts which History has recorded in reference to families, and to trace the different lines of conduct which men in different ages of the world have thought it right to pursue in reference to their households.

Every man sustains a most important relation in reference to other men. He is a partaker of the same nature; he exercises the same faculties; he is endowed with the same feelings; and his origin, his wants, his pleasures, and his

afflictions, his progress, and his exit, are all similar. While, however, the powers and passions of men are the same in kind, they are different in degree; while all have the same faculties, each faculty is not in each individual of the same degree of strength: hence, while all men have a general resemblance, the unequal preponderance of different principles will produce different shades of character. As thus one man may possess, in a high degree, a valuable quality in which another man is deficient, it is for their advantage to associate together, and, by their frequent intercourse, to improve each other. Intellectual wealth is not like material wealth; the man who gives does not diminish his stores.

Even in Paradise it was not deemed good that man should be alone. And the Author of Nature, by creating mankind of different sexes, and by connecting the different generations of men and interweaving them with each other, has most effectually prevented man from becoming a solitary being. Man now stands in new relations: he has passions adapted to these new relations; and he has additional relative duties to perform.

The physical constitution of man is more strong, more robust than that of women—more adapted for labour and fatigue. Women are usually shorter and more slender, and possess much less physical strength. The faculties and dispositions of their minds correspond to their physical energies. Man is more adapted for the exercise of the strong and vigorous faculties of the mind; woman is more disposed to the soft and tender emotions of the heart. In both a physical and intellectual sense woman possesses beauty—man possesses strength. In consequence of this difference of character, they feel a stronger attachment to each other, and they are, at the same time, better qualified for their respective duties.

Though men and women in all ages have agreed to dwell together, the circumstances of their union have considerably varied. In some countries men have one wife; in other countries they have many. Sometimes the marriage union has been for life; at other times it has been dissolved at the pleasure of either one or both of the parties. In some coun-

tries there have been two kinds of marriage; and in one case the female has been called a wife, in the other a concubine. In some countries the husband has had the power of putting his wife to death; in others he could inflict chastisement; in others he is compelled to keep the peace.

Consequent upon this relation of husband and wife, arises another relation,—that of parents and children.

The records of history present a variety of singular circumstances in reference to this degree of relationship. In different periods, parents have adopted different systems of education. In some countries, children have been exposed to hardship; have been killed for imbecility, or sacrificed to idols. Some laws have allowed fathers to put their children to death; others have required children to support their aged parents; and in some countries, children have put their parents to death.

The third relation is that which subsists between masters and servants.

And the fourth is that which subsists between owner and slave.

The relation which man sustains to other men will more properly come under consideration in the Philosophy of Political History. In the present Lecture, upon the Philosophy of Domestic History, we shall consider these four relations:—

1. The relation between husband and wife.
2. The relation between parents and children.
3. The relation between masters and servants.
4. The relation between owner and slave.

I am first to notice the relation between husband and wife.

By all the nations of antiquity, marriage was regarded as nothing more than a civil contract between the parties. Although the most refined nations had deities who presided over marriage, as well as over every other circumstance of life, and to whom they offered sacrifice, yet the ceremony did not take place in the temple, nor was the presence of a priest necessary to its celebration.

Though Moses gave several laws relative to marriage, yet it does not appear that it was at all necessary to be solemnized by a priest or a Levite; but, no doubt, it was registered by some public officer, as the Jews were very particular in regard to their genealogies. Jesus Christ was present at a marriage in Cana of Galilee; but he does not appear to have performed any religious rites, any other than the act by which he provided the means of celebrating it with that festivity which accorded with the custom of the country.

The establishment of Christianity by Constantine made no alteration in the customs of the Romans in reference to marriage. The ceremony was never performed in a church, nor by a priest, until the year 1200, when it was directed to be so celebrated by a bull of Pope Innocent the Third. This was the Pope to whom our King John resigned the crown of England—the Pope who placed France under an interdict, and who set on foot the crusade against the Albigenses.

In Scotland, marriage is now a civil contract. Should even two persons agree to become husband and wife, without * any farther forms, it would be thought an informal, yet a real marriage.

In Persia, marriage is performed by a civil magistrate. In our country, during the protectorate of Oliver Cromwell, the marriage took place before a justice of the peace. At the time of the French Revolution, it was enacted, that the marriages in that country should take place before a civil magistrate. The parties may subsequently proceed, if they please, to the church, and have the religious services performed; but this is not necessary to the validity of the marriage. With us the Jews and the Quakers are allowed to marry themselves in their own way. In Ireland, not only Catholic priests, but dissenting ministers, are permitted to perform the marriage ceremony to members of their own communion. The Unitarians have attempted to obtain a bill permitting their ministers to perform the marriage ceremony

* The reader will recollect that this was written in the year 1826, before the passing of the Marriage Act by Sir Robert Peel.

among their own members, without prejudice to the pecuniary interests of the Established Church; and thus liberate the Unitarian body from the necessity of commencing the most interesting relation of life by an act of hypocrisy. In the Roman Catholic Church, marriage is one of the seven sacraments—a sacrament, however, which is denied to the priests.

The ceremonies of marriage have differed very much among particular nations.

The season of the year which the Greeks preferred for this purpose was the winter, and particularly the month of January. Among the Romans, the kalends, nones, and ides of every month were deemed unlucky for the celebration of marriage. As was also the Feast of the Parentalia, and the whole month of May. The most happy season, in every respect, was that which followed the ides of June.

As the marriages of citizens have so important an influence upon the welfare of the community, it is not wonderful that they should be the subject of legal enactments.

The ancients seem to have entertained none of that horror of excessive population which appears to be so prevalent in our own days.* In some countries, laws were passed for the purpose of increasing the number of marriages: these laws have, for the most part, been enforced in times of luxury and dissipation. Among nations who are comparatively poor, and who are distinguished by the fewness of their wants, and the simplicity of their manners, marriage is very general; but as they have become wealthy, luxury has increased, cities have been founded and enlarged, and the illicit intercourse between the sexes has diminished the number of marriages. Such was the case with Rome; and Augustus Cæsar passed many laws to compel the Roman citizens to marry. None but married men could receive an inheritance left them by will; none but married women could wear certain kinds of

* In 1826, the doctrine of Malthus with regard to population was almost universally received. It was advocated by the Quarterly, the Edinburgh, and the Westminster Reviews.

ornaments. Married men had a particular place of honour assigned them at the theatre.

The reason which the Romans assigned for not marrying, was the corrupt manners of the women; but it appears that the manners of the men were equally corrupt.

"After the commonwealths of Greece were settled, marriage was very much encouraged by their laws; and the abstaining from it was discountenanced, and, in many places, punished. The Lacedæmonians were very remarkable for their severity towards those who deferred marriage beyond a limited time, as well as to those who wholly abstained from it. The Athenians had an express law, that all commanders, orators, and persons intrusted with any public affair, should be married men."—*Encyc. Brit.*

Fleury remarks, that the ancient Israelites could get on in the world better if they were married than if they were single. In that nation the people were all agriculturists. The women attended to the household affairs, and were also useful in the management of the farm. Besides this, the women were all employed in spinning, and manufacturing both their own clothes and those of their husbands. This appears to have been the employment of women, both before and after marriage, in all agricultural nations. "Lucretia, with her maids, was found spinning when her husband, Collatinus, paid a visit to her from the camp. Tanaquilis, or Caia Cecilia, the wife of king Tarquin, was an excellent spinner of wool. Her wool, with a distaff and spindle, long remained in the temple of Sangus; and a garment made by her, worn by Servius Tullius, was preserved in the temple of Fortune. Hence, it became a custom for maidens to accompany new-married women with a distaff and spindle, with wool with them, signifying what they were principally to attend to. Augustus Cæsar usually wore no garments but such as were made at home by his wife, sister, or daughter. Homer represents both Helen and Penelope employed at their looms."—*Oriental Customs.*

Such, too, was the employment of the unmarried females, at least in our own country in former times; and hence an unmarried female, whatever might be her age, is still called

a spinster. Indeed, before the introduction of the spinning-jennies, our farmers' wives and daughters had considerable employment of this kind. The linen manufacture of Ireland, is, in its first stages, performed by women at their own habitations, and who sell the produce of their industry to the manufacturer. The application of the term spinster to single women *only* would lead us to suppose that, in former times, when women became married, they did not continue to spin. The use of this term is still continued, probably from the difficulty of finding a substitute.

The *age* at which persons entered into the married state was different among different nations. It does not appear that in the days of the ancients people married very young. Isaac and Esau were forty, and Jacob seventy-five years of age when they married.

"The Spartans were not permitted to marry till they had arrived at their full strength; the reason assigned for which custom, by Lycurgus, was, that the Spartan children might be strong and vigorous. And the Athenian laws are said to have once ordered that men should not marry till thirty-five years of age."—*Encyc. Brit.*

Augustus Cæsar ordained that no woman should be married under twelve years of age. This was to prevent the Romans evading the marriage law by espousing young girls.

But the Orientals have always married at an earlier age than the Europeans. In India women are capable of becoming mothers at eleven, ten, or even nine years of age. Mahomet betrothed one of his wives at five years of age, and married her at eight.

These early marriages are exceedingly pernicious. The effect upon the physical constitution of the women is obvious; for they have all the appearance and infirmities of old women at the age of twenty. And this, no doubt, is the one cause of the weak constitution of the men also, and joins with the influence of climate in producing that physical weakness in consequence of which the natives of India have always been defeated by every power which has assailed them. The Jews of Poland are a feeble and dwarfish race of men, though

living in a cold climate; chiefly, it is presumed, in consequence of their early marriages. Besides, as the women are taken almost from the cradle to become wives, they have no opportunity of mental cultivation—no attention is bestowed upon their education. Being wholly destitute of knowledge, they are not fit companions for intelligent men: they remain all their lives children; and as children they are treated. As soon as their short-lived beauty has faded, they are regarded with contempt. The female who wishes to retain her charms to the autumnal period of life, and the youth who wishes to survive to a green old age, should avoid an early marriage. But, alas! what avail maxims of prudence on such a subject as this? Who can control a whirlwind, or extinguish a volcano?

The intermarriage of persons within certain degrees of relationship has, in all ages, been interdicted.

The marriage of parents and children is so obviously opposed to the dictates of nature that they have been prohibited among all nations. Yet a most horrible custom prevailed in ancient Persia. It was required that the high priest should always be the child of a mother by her own son; hence, marriages of this kind were permitted among the Chaldæans and the Persians—the disciples of Zoroaster. It is said that the Tartars, though they do not marry their mothers, sometimes marry their daughters.

The marriage of brothers and sisters has, for the most part, been prohibited, though there are many exceptions. The Athenians permitted a brother and a sister to marry, provided they had different mothers; but not if they had the same mother, even if they had different fathers. It would appear that a similar law was established in Egypt during the patriarchial age; for Abraham, in justifying himself for calling his wife his sister, stated that she was the daughter of his father, but not the daughter of his mother, and she became his wife. At Sparta, it is said, a contrary practice prevailed; for there a brother and sister, by the mother's side, were permitted to marry, but not by the father's side. It seems that, in ancient Persia, the marriages of brothers and sisters were

prohibited; for when Cambyses was inclined to marry his sister, he collected together the Magi, and asked them if it was lawful for him to marry his sister. The Magi were afraid of offending the monarch, and had recourse to artifice. They told him there was no law allowing a brother to marry his sister; but there was a law which declared that the king of Persia might do whatever he liked. This law was deemed sufficient for the purpose, and the marriage took place.

Under the Jewish law, the marriage of brothers and sisters was strictly prohibited. But if a man died and left a wife without any children, his brother was obliged to marry the widow; and the children of this marriage would be entitled to the property of the deceased, and be esteemed legally his children. All the Jews were landholders; and this law was designed to prevent the inheritance passing into another family. As the modern Jews are placed in different circumstances, this law is now very rarely observed.

Among the ancient Egyptians, marriages between brothers and sisters were performed in honour of Isis. The marriage between a brother and a sister-in-law was permitted both in Egypt and in India.

These marriages were never permitted at any time among the Romans.

A notion has prevailed, in some parts of this kingdom, that a man is allowed by law to marry the sister of his deceased wife. This is quite an error; such a marriage is void *ab initio*, and all the children are illegitimate. It has been contended that such a marriage is not, in so many words, prohibited by the law of Moses; but the marriage of a woman with the brother of a deceased husband (except under the circumstances to which I have referred) is expressly condemned; and, hence, by analogy, we may infer that the other is equally objectionable.

"The marriages of uncles and nieces, aunts and nephews, were also prohibited by the Mosaic Law; though, in the time of Herod the Great, several marriages of this kind took place among the members of his family. It is said that the marriage of a great-uncle with a great-niece is not opposed to the

letter of either the English or the Jewish law, how much soever it may be opposed to their spirit."—*Paley.*

Marriages between first cousins, or any more remote relations, is not prohibited either by the English or the Jewish law; nor were they prohibited by the laws of any of the nations of antiquity, except by the Romans at the commencement of their government. But the canons of the Roman Catholic church prohibited marriage within the seventh degree of relationship. These canons also recognize spiritual relationship. Thus, if two men stood godfathers for the same child, they became spiritual brothers; and, consequently, no marriages could take place between their respective families, any more than though they had been real brothers: but since the Reformation, these canons have not been observed in England. Though the Roman Catholic Church has prohibited marriages between certain degrees of natural and spiritual relationship, yet the head of the Church has the power of permitting marriages to take place between even those degrees which are deemed unlawful by Protestants. Several marriages of this kind have taken place by dispensation in the royal family of Portugal. Marriage to the fourth degree is condemned by the Koran.

In some nations, marriages have been prohibited between different classes of the citizens. The twelve tribes of Israel could not intermarry, lest the inheritances should pass from one tribe to another. The different castes in ancient Egypt and in India could not intermarry. In Rome, the patricians could not engage in marriage with the plebeians. This law was, however, repealed; and it had the effect of changing the whole frame of government. Previous to this, Rome was a republic; the aristocratical and the democratical interests balanced each other. Afterwards it became a perfect democracy, and soon terminated where democracies usually terminate—in the establishment of an absolute despotism. A Roman could marry none but a Roman; and such was the law in most of the Grecian states.

"In this country, the consent of the father, if he be living, of the mother, if she survive the father, or of the guardians

if both the parents be dead, is necessary to the marriage of a person under twenty-one years of age. Among the Romans, and among some of the states of Greece, the consent of parents was required so long as they lived. In France, before the revolution, the consent of parents was necessary to the marriage of sons until they had attained thirty years of age; of daughters, until twenty-five. In Holland, for sons, till twenty-five; for daughters, till twenty."—*Paley.*

The intermarriage of persons nearly related to each other would lead to opposing relative duties. It is the duty of a son to obey his mother. It is the duty of a wife to obey her husband. But if a woman sustain the relation of both mother and wife to the same man, in what way can these conflicting duties be performed? The marriage of brothers and sisters should also be prohibited, as it would lead to an early intimacy; indeed, brothers and sisters must then be destitute of those feelings of attachment which is experienced when their marriage is prohibited: their attachment to each other would be, from the moment of its existence, a sexual attachment; and living together at home, a premature indulgence would be the result. It is thought that, in the early ages, it was customary to prohibit the marriage of all persons who were brought up together in the same house; and hence it was that the marriage of first cousins was prohibited among the early Romans; for, when brothers married, they did not remove from home, but lived together as one family; and hence, it became necessary to prohibit marriages between their children. But where it is customary for brothers and sisters, as soon as they are married, to have separate habitations, no evil can arise from the permission of marriage between their descendants.

It has been thought that the marriage of near relations produces an important physical effect. It is certain that among the irrational animals, if the species be continued from near relations, the race will decline. A similar effect, it is contended, takes place in reference to man; and that the offspring of a marriage between near relations are weak in body, and imbecile in mind. History does not furnish us

with sufficient information to lay this down as a general rule; but numerous instances of individual families have been adduced; and the evidence appears to be in favour of this sentiment.

The propriety or impropriety of preventing marriages between different classes of the community depends altogether upon political expediency. In such a state as Rome, where there were only two powers, and it was necessary that these powers should be balanced against one another, the aristocratical party were obliged to invest themselves with some privileges, to enable them to control the democratical party, who possessed, as they must in all nations, the physical strength of the community. The prohibition of marriage between those parties tended, probably, to exalt the patrician class in the estimation of the populace, and thus enabled them more effectually to exercise their influence in maintaining their position in the constitution. In countries which possess a different form of government, the same regulations are not necessary.

It is, too, from reasons of political expediency that regulations are enacted respecting the marriage of the members of the royal family of England. It is thought advisable that our princes and princesses should marry the members of the royal families of foreign states, in preference to marrying any of the subjects of the crown of Great Britain. Though our law does not go so far as to enact this, yet such is its spirit. If the members of our royal family were to marry into the families of our nobility, the alliance which these noble families would have to the crown would necessarily give them a high degree of influence, which would perhaps be incompatible with the interests of the country. It would then be an object of party ambition to procure a marriage of some noble family into the royal line. The king, instead of standing aloof, as he now does from all parties, would become a party man; his prime minister would probably be his father-in-law, his uncle, or his cousin, whom he would not easily be induced to change, however disastrous his administration may have been. The peerage would be

disgraced, although some individuals might be exalted. The nobles who were in alliance with the royal house would form a rank of themselves, and would look with an air of superiority upon an ordinary nobleman. During the middle ages, much disorder and civil war arose from contests between great houses who were allied to the crown.

Though there is no law upon the subject, yet we find, among ourselves, that wealthy and noble families do not frequently consent that any intermarriages should take place with an inferior family. This feeling is not confined to the nobility, but extends to merchants and tradesmen. In our country the love of money is the ruling passion; and even marriage is too often conducted in the spirit of traffic.

Among most of the nations of antiquity, and throughout the whole of Asia at the present day, where Christianity is not established, the husband buys his wife.

Such was the case among the Egyptians, the Jews, the Greeks, and the Arabs, but not among the Romans.

Such, too, was the case among the ancient Germans; and Tacitus produces this as a proof that the Germans had made but small progress in civilization.

In China, at the present day, the father sells his daughter, either for a wife or a concubine, to the highest bidder.

At Constantinople, the market for slaves and wives is a large court or yard, round which there are porticoes; here the softer sex are brought out and sold, in the same way as with us cattle are taken to Smithfield.

To a well-regulated mind, nothing can be more revolting than the idea of a man going to such a market to buy a wife. He looks round with cool indifference, fixes upon the one congenial to his taste, then haggles and chaffers with the seller, dispraises her, and points out all her defects, in order to cheapen the price, in the same way as though he were buying a horse; at last he pulls out his purse, leads home his purchase, and makes her his wife. Such a scene can excite nothing but sensations of unmingled disgust.

I have met with the observation somewhere, that in all nations where wives are purchased they are treated as slaves;

but, in comparing this observation with the facts of history, I do not find that it is universally true. In reference to the Turks, the Arabs, and the Persians, it is, no doubt, correct; but I do not find that the ancient Jews, nor the Greeks, nor the Germans, treated their wives as slaves. I believe, however, that it may be observed with truth, that, in all countries where wives are purchased, they have been liable to be divorced at the pleasure of their husbands. They are regarded as property which the husband may renounce whenever he pleases, although he cannot dispose of them to another man. If, as Fleury observes, a man increased his wealth by the addition of a wife, this circumstance may account for the difference of manners on this point between the ancient and modern times.

The price which men paid for their wives probably varied at different periods: Jacob paid seven years' service for each of his wives.

The moderns have made great discoveries by applying Mathematics to Natural Philosophy. The Oriental nations appear to have applied arithmetic to morals, but with far less happy results. Finding that one wife was a great comfort, they seem to have imagined that, by doubling or trebling the number of their wives, they should double or treble their comforts.

Polygamy was not permitted among the ancient Greeks generally, nor yet among the Romans. Mark Antony was the first who had two wives. The Emperor Valentinian permitted every man to have as many wives as he pleased. Polygamy, however, never appears to have been much practised among the Romans; most of them seem to have thought that one wife was enough.

But, in the more Eastern nations, polygamy has been practised from the earliest times. The practice was common among the patriarchs, and was followed by their children, the Jews; and though the Hebrew legislator laid it under some restraint, he did not prohibit the practice.

It was permitted, too, in Egypt, Babylon, and Persia, in

ancient as well as in modern times. We read of the Persian monarchs taking their wives and concubines with them when they went to fight against the armies of Greece.

Mahomet allowed every good Mussulman to have four wives, and as many concubines as he pleased.

Polygamy is permitted in China; but such is the poverty of the people, and such is the difficulty of maintaining even one wife, that but few Chinese have more.

In Oriental climes the monarchs appear often to have had many wives, imagining that it gave them increased dignity in the eyes of the people. Thus Solomon had seven hundred wives and three hundred concubines; several of the Turkish sultans, and some of the Chinese emperors, have had an equal number.

We are not to suppose that, because polygamy was permitted by the laws of these countries, every man availed himself of this privilege. It is said that the modern Arabs usually marry only one wife, and very rarely more than two. In our own country, every man is permitted to marry one wife; yet we do not all avail ourselves of this privilege.

Paley, in his "Moral Philosophy," thus points out the evil effects of polygamy. And the facts of history amply bear out the observations of the philosopher:—

"1. It produces contests and jealousies among the wives of the same husband.

"2. Distracted affections, or the loss of all affection in the husband.

"3. A voluptuousness in the rich, which dissolves the vigour of intellectual as well as their active faculties, producing that indolence and imbecility, both of mind and body, which have long characterised the nations of the East.

"4. The abasement of one half the human species, who, in countries where polygamy obtains, are degraded into mere instruments of physical pleasure to the other half.

"5. Neglect of children.

"6. The manifold mischiefs that frequently arise from a scarcity of women.

"To compensate for these evils, polygamy does not offer a

single advantage. In the article of population, which it has been thought to promote, the communities gain nothing. For the question is, not whether one man will have more children by five or six wives than by one, but whether these five wives would not bear the same or a greater number of children to five separate husbands. And as to the care of the children when produced, and the sending of them into the world in situations in which they may be likely to form and bring up families of their own, upon which the increase and succession of the human species depend, this is less provided for, and less practicable, where twenty or thirty children are to be supported by the attention and fortunes of one father, than if they were divided into five or six families, to each of which were assigned the industry and inheritance of two parents."

"The equality in the number of males and females brought into the world intimates the intention of God that one woman should be assigned to one man; for, if to one man be allowed the exclusive right to four or five women, four or more men must be deprived the exclusive possession of any, which could never be the order intended.

"It seems, also, a pretty significant indication of the Divine will, that He at first created only one woman to one man. Had God intended polygamy for the species, it is probable He would have begun with it; especially, as by giving to Adam more wives than one, the multiplication of the human race would have proceeded with a quicker progress."

Polygamy has probably led in the East to the practice of confining the women. A man who has a hundred wives might suppose that he could not secure their conjugal fidelity but by placing them under restraint. It has been said that the confinement of women in the East is the result of the influence of climate; but as the climate operates equally on both sexes, it is not easy to perceive the necessity for confinement. It is owing, more probably, to the jealously of the husbands, occasioned, in the first instance, by polygamy.

Mr. Bruce, in his Travels, attempts to justify polygamy among the Arabs by stating that, as the women in that country commence bearing children at eleven years of age,

and cease bearing at twenty, the period during which each woman is capable of bearing children is only nine years; whereas he considers that in our country women are capable of having children for the space of thirty-four years. But why is it that the women in that country become aged sooner than the men? In our country, women live to a more advanced age than the other sex. This is now so well ascertained, that some insurance offices charge a lower premium upon the insurance of females than on male lives. We know of no physical cause why the women of warm climates should not live as long as the men. It is probably their early marriages which diminish the length of their lives.

The Rev. Mr. Madan, who, about forty years ago, published two octavo volumes in defence of polygamy, assigns, as one reason in its defence, that it would make wives more submissive to their husbands. It might attain this object; but the feelings of a slave are not those feelings which a husband would wish to implant in the mind of his wife. In our country, conjugal affection is not a mere sensual passion; it includes also friendship, mutual confidence, unity of sentiments and of objects. These feelings cannot subsist between two individuals unless they approach nearly to an equality, and unless each party is in the sole possession of the affections of the other party. A woman who knows her husband has twenty wives never can entertain for him those feelings of attachment of which she would be susceptible did she believe she was the exclusive object of his affections; and a man who professes to love twenty women does not love any one of them in the manner in which a husband ought to love his wife.

It is no uncommon thing for fathers to advise their sons to pursue a line of conduct different from that which they have followed themselves. Solomon, who from his own experience was well qualified to judge of the advantages of polygamy, advised his son to have only one wife, urging him to rejoice with the wife (not wives) of his youth, letting her charms satisfy him at all times, and being always ravished with her love. This advice of Solomon's was treated by his

son with just as much respect as young folks usually treat the advice of their parents, when a question of marriage is concerned.

Polygamy is expressly forbidden in the New Testament: "Whosoever putteth away his wife," says Jesus Christ, "and marrieth another, committeth adultery." If putting away a wife and marrying another was an act of adultery, then, *à fortiori*, it would be an act of adultery to marry another without putting the first away. St. Paul also expressly declares: "Let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband."

In our country, as well as in every other Christian country, polygamy is unlawful. It is treated as a criminal offence.

While some nations have thus abused the marriage relation by giving it too wide a latitude, others have placed it under too great a restraint. It was discreditable among the Romans for a man to marry a second time, even after his first wife was dead. This impression, however, seems afterwards to have been removed; for Augustus Cæsar compelled a widower to marry again within two years after the death of his wife, or else to subject himself to the legal disabilities imposed upon bachelors. Soon after the publication of Christianity, the doctrine of Monogamy was revived. The writers who are called the Fathers of the Church were very strongly against second marriages. It is difficult to imagine to what objections they could be exposed. If a single man was allowed to have a wife, why should he not have another as soon as the first was dead, particularly as he might then have children, whose interests, no less than his own, might require the attention of a mother?

I had forgotten to mention, that, in some parts of the East, it was not customary to marry the younger sister before the elder. We learn this from the history of Jacob and Laban. So in the Gentoo laws it is made criminal for a man to give his younger daughter in marriage before the elder, or for a younger son to marry while his elder brother remains unmarried.

In most of the ancient nations there were two kinds of marriage, celebrated in two different ways, and followed by different privileges in reference to the wife. When a man married his equal in regard to rank, and intended to bestow upon her those privileges suited to her rank, she was called his wife; she was the mistress of his house, and shared his honours, and was regarded as entitled to that respect which was rendered to her husband: but if the woman he married was of inferior rank, the marriage ceremony was not performed in the same way, and she was not the mistress of his house, nor entitled to share that respect which was rendered to her husband; in this place she was called a concubine. Abraham took Hagar to be his concubine, while Sarah was his wife; Jacob had two wives and two concubines; David had several wives, and a still greater number of concubines; Solomon had seven hundred wives who were princesses, and three hundred concubines, women of inferior rank. The Turks are said to have three sorts of marriage, conferring different degrees of dignity upon their wives. But this distinction between wives and concubines was not confined to those nations who practised polygamy; it prevailed among all the nations of antiquity,—even among the Greeks and the Romans, who were not polygamists. This distinction is observed to this day in some parts of Germany: the inferior marriage is called a left-handed marriage, because, in performing the ceremony, the husband gives his left hand instead of the right.

In reading sacred history, we must not suppose that the term "concubine" has the same meaning as the word "harlot," or that it implies any moral delinquency on the part of the individual. We must not imagine that a concubine at all resembled a kept mistress; a concubine was a real wife, only taken from a rank inferior to her husband. In case of conjugal infidelity, the concubine was punished for adultery in the same way as the wife.

In our country, every woman who is married expects to share the rank and honours of her husband; and every man who is about to get married knows that he must maintain his

wife in a manner suitable, not to her former rank in society, but suitable to his own rank. This, in many cases, must operate as a bar to marriage. If a man forms an attachment to a woman of inferior rank, he would, perhaps, feel a strong inclination to make her his wife; but then, if he do, he must introduce her to all his friends in that character, and she must associate with persons whose education, whose manners, and whose habits, are altogether different from her own. Hence he must do violence to his own feelings, in order to maintain with credit his caste in society; but if he could marry her in a legal manner, and, at the same time, not be expected to place her at the head of his table when his friends visit him, nor to take her with him when he visited them; if he could marry without being expected to make any addition to his establishment, and without anticipating any cold or distant treatment from his friends for having degraded the family by an unsuitable match,—if he could do this, and his children nevertheless be legitimate, it is probable the effect would be beneficial: it would diminish the number of kept mistresses; it would enable men to enjoy the pleasures of wedlock in a more frugal way; and it would increase the number of marriages between rich men and poor women, and, consequently, leave a greater number of rich women to be married to poor men; thus preventing a too great inequality of wealth among the different classes of the community. Should, however, two kinds of marriages ever be introduced into our country, we must not employ the word concubine, as this term has very undeservedly got into disrepute.

Courtesans have existed in almost every age of the world, and have by some nations been publicly recognised. They were tolerated at Athens by the laws of Solon, who imagined that by this means he prevented the seduction of the wives and daughters of the citizens. Most of the women were strangers; the man who debauched an Athenian woman was liable to a penalty. To associate with these women was hardly deemed discreditable. The virtuous Socrates eulogized Aspasia, the favourite lady of Pericles. At Corinth, these characters abounded: at Rome, both Cicero and Cato adopted the

sentiments of Solon, and were among the apologists of vice. When they commenced this course of life, they often changed their names;—women whose grandfathers, father, or husband, had been a Roman knight, were forbidden to become public courtesans. Among the Jews, too, though opposed to their laws, they appear not to be uncommon; but, among a nation chiefly of agriculturists, and having the privilege of marrying as many wives as they pleased, and of divorcing when they pleased those they had married, it is not probable that this practice was carried to any great extent: yet, in the voluptuous reign of Solomon, these characters must have been numerous, or he would not have given his son so many injunctions to avoid their company. He always refers to them under the epithet "strange women," which would lead us to suppose that they were principally foreign women who engaged in these practices; indeed, a departure from chastity, on the part of a Hebrew daughter, was attended with the punishment of being burnt alive, "because she hath committed whoredom in her father's house."

It is strange that religion should ever have been invoked to sanctify practices such as these; yet such was the case amongst almost all the Pagan nations of antiquity. In Babylon at the festival of the chief female divinity, and at the feasts held in honour of Venus and Cupid, in every part of the ancient world, the most shameful scenes of immorality were exhibited. Those who recollect the history of Balaam, will remember that he advised Balak to proclaim a feast in honour of an idol, and to send forth beautiful women, to entice the Israelites to idolatry.

However sanctioned by their authority the opinion may be which was entertained by Solon, Cicero, and Cato, it is nevertheless incorrect. It was when the number of courtesans increased that Augustus Cæsar inflicted additional penalties upon adultery. Venice was, for ages, remarkable for their number; but so far was this from securing the virtue of the other women, that private intrigue was universal.

In all ages it has been the opinion of mankind that a departure from chastity on the part of a woman is more

criminal than similar conduct on the part of a man. Though this opinion appears, at first view, to be capricious, it is, perhaps, not incorrect. Upon female chastity depend all the relations of human life; without this, men are reduced to the condition of brutes. Women, too, are probably endowed with a natural feeling of modesty, and it is certain their wantonness exposes them to greater evils than it does men; hence it is, that if women arrive to the same degree of crime as men, it marks a higher degree of depravity, because they have greater obstacles to overcome. The degree of infamy attached to their character is the reason why women who have lost their chastity are often deficient in every other virtue; no other virtue can be deemed an equivalent for the one they have lost; no future good conduct can atone for the past: hence one of the chief incentives to virtue has no influence on their minds.

Connected with the relation between husband and wife is the subject of divorce.

In all ages, and in all countries, divorce, under some circumstances or other, has been permitted by the laws. But considerable variety has existed as to the latitude in which this privilege has been enjoyed. In the different States of Greece the laws were various. The Cretans allowed divorce to any man who was afraid of having too many children: at Sparta, it was deemed scandalous for a woman to leave her husband; the Roman laws permitted divorce, but no instance occurred of the exercise of this privilege for the first five hundred years of their existence as a nation;—at that period, Spurius Carvilius divorced his wife on account of barrenness. At Athens, divorces were permitted on very slight grounds.

To preserve proper registers of marriage, and to prevent irregularities, it was necessary that all divorces should take place publicly, and before a magistrate. The Romans had a sort of domestic tribunal: in cases of disputes between the husband and wife, the relations of the parties were called in, and formed a sort of tribunal, in which it was decided how far it was necessary for the husband to avail himself of the

privilege of divorce. The interposition of such an authority must have softened the exercise of those powers which were bestowed upon the husband; for, according to the laws of Romulus, the husband had the power, not only of divorce, but also of life and death over his wife, in case she attempted to poison him, or used false keys: from the latter case we should infer that the Roman husbands did not usually intrust their wives with their treasures. On the termination of the republic, the domestic tribunal was abolished, and suits for divorce were brought before the civil magistrate.

Among the Jews, husbands appear to have the right of divorcing their wives without assigning any reason whatever; in other nations, the husband stated his reasons, and, in some states, the magistrates were to judge whether those reasons were satisfactory. The usual reasons were, age, barrenness, disease, madness, and banishment. The form of divorce among the Jews was the following:—"On such a day, month, year, and place, I, N——, divorce you voluntarily, put you away, restore you to your liberty, even you, M——, who were heretofore my wife, and I permit you to marry whom you please."

But, while divorce was permitted by the Jewish laws, there were numerous checks to its exercise. To say nothing of those feelings of attachment which a man would naturally feel for the companion of his youth and the mother of his children, there were other preventive circumstances. Among the Jews of Palestine, no man would think of living without a wife. If, then, he divorced one, he must get another, and he must buy her, too. Here, then, would be a diminution of his wealth. If he had treated his first wife ill, he might not find it so easy to buy another, at least, not of a father who had any regard for the happiness of his children. Besides, as polygamy was permitted to the Jews as well as divorce, a husband would be more likely, in many circumstances, to take a second wife in addition to the first, rather than put the first away.

It is not always easy to form an opinion of the manners of a people from their laws. The manners of a people regulate

the daily habits of life, whereas laws are often designed to meet extraordinary cases. In those countries where divorce was permitted, it was not, perhaps, frequently practised; at least, not in a capricious manner. Throughout the whole history of the Old Testament there does not occur a single instance of divorce. In later times, perhaps, it was more frequent. Josephus, the Jewish historian, at the time he wrote was married to his third wife, having divorced two, because, as he said, he did not like their manners.

The privilege of divorce has usually been given to the husband, but not to the wife. In the latter period of the Roman republic, a wife might sue for a divorce as well as the husband. Among the Jews, Salome, the sister of King Herod the Great, was the first Jewish lady who assumed the privilege of divorcing her husband; after that period, several other wives thought it convenient to follow her example.

In our country, a complete divorce, so as to enable the parties to marry again, can be obtained only by Act of Parliament;* the only grounds are adultery and wilful abandonment. A divorce *a mensâ et thoro,* from bed and board, which liberates the husband from being compelled to support his wife, and by which he is no longer deemed the father of any children she may subsequently bear, may be obtained by a sentence of the ecclesiastical courts.

The permission of divorce at the caprice of the husband, or on very slight grounds, must be considered as a defect in any code of laws, and would never be admitted by an enlightened legislator, unless he were constrained to do so by the inveterate habits of the people. A facility of divorce prevents the husband and wife feeling any unity of interest; partners who engage to trade together for a limited time are always looking forward to the period of dissolution, and are making arrangements to contend against one another. Just so would it be with husband and wife. Reserve and mistrust would characterise all their communications, and each party would guard against the possible designs of the other. A divorce would have a pernicious effect upon the education

* This was written in 1826.

and interests of the children. Deprived of a mother by whom they were beloved, they would be committed to the care of a stranger who might have children of her own, by whom they might be supplanted in their inheritance. The consciousness which each party feels that their marriage is indissoluble tends to prevent the indulgence of angry feeling, and the continuance of conjugal hostility; while, at the same time, it diminishes the number of rash and hasty marriages. The consideration that a step once taken cannot be recalled will induce people to reflect before they resolve upon taking that step.

With whatever lenity mankind have been disposed to regard incontinence, they have always thought that severe punishments ought to be inflicted upon the commission of adultery. Among the Greeks, it was punished severely, though, in later times, the rich were allowed to commute their punishment for a sum of money. At Rome, Romulus made it a capital crime; Augustus Cæsar put several persons to death for adultery; under Constantine, adulterers were burnt, or sewed in sacks and thrown into the sea; under Macrinus, they were burnt at the stake; under Leo and Marcian, they were perpetually banished, or were punished by cutting off the nose. By the law of Moses, it was declared that the adulterer and the adultress should both be put to death. By the ancient Egyptians, it was punished by cutting off the nose of the woman, and imprisoning the man. The early Saxons burned the woman, and over the fire they erected a gibbet, on which the man was hanged. Mankind appear to have racked their invention, for the purpose of finding out suitable punishments for adultery; some of these punishments are unfit to be recited in a public assembly. In many nations, cutting off the nose has been a favourite punishment.

In our own country, adultery was formerly punished by the loss of eyes, ears, and other mutilations of the body: in the present day it is no crime at all; the adulterer is merely liable to a civil action at the suit of the husband, to whom,

according to the verdict of the jury, he is compelled to pay a sum of money.

Adultery is an act so pernicious to the family in which it occurs; it is attended with so much misery to the husband and the children, and often to the adultress and her family, and it has so pernicious an influence upon the interests of the community in which it is prevalent, that every means should be employed for its prevention. The question is, whether the making it a criminal act, and punishing it, like theft, by the civil power, would tend to the attainment of this object. The decision of this question will depend upon the moral character of the people of Great Britain. Laws will produce opposite effects according to the character of the people to whom they are given. If the moral character of the people of this country be so corrupt,—if they think so lightly of adultery, that the sending of an adulterer or an adultress to the treadmill would call forth the exercise of public sympathy, then would a penal law do more harm than good; but if the public feeling be generally virtuous, then may we venture to make adultery a penal offence. By classing adultery with crimes, the public opinion might view it with great horror; whatever is legal is deemed innocent, and hence it is, probably, that, in common conversation, a man guilty of petty larceny is deemed a more atrocious character than an adulterer. As a means of prevention, it appears certain that a man of property would dread the idea of being tried as a criminal at the Old Bailey much more than the parting with some portion of his superfluous wealth. Our law, too, appears imperfect, as it inflicts no punishment on the adultress, although it may be that she is the most guilty party. All the husband can do is to obtain a divorce, though that will cost a sum of money which the generality of husbands are unable to afford; the injured husband must, therefore, in most cases, rest contented with the injury he has received, without being the object of even public sympathy,—for so capricious is public feeling, that while the overflowings of benevolence are extended to sufferers of almost every class, they are seldom extended to the man who has received this,

the most cruel of all injuries. Since this is the state of our laws respecting adultery and divorce, those who are ruminating upon marriage should make it the chief object to be well satisfied of the moral character of the party to whom they are to be joined in these adamantine chains.

It has been disputed whether the affection of parents for their children be a natural instinct of human nature, or whether it be the growth of intercourse. Those who contend that parental affection is a derived and not an inherent feeling, attempt to prove the accuracy of their sentiments by referring to the acts of cruelty and neglect exercised by parents towards their children—by adverting to the practice of exposing children and of sacrificing them to idols—and by adducing the frequent quarrels between parents and children in our own time.

We may lay it down as a general principle, that whatever is universal is natural; and as parents universally love their children, we may infer that parental affection is natural.

There are two ways in which this argument may be met. It is true, it may be said, that parents universally love their children; but then parents are universally associated with their children. They are acquainted with them from their infancy—they feel pleasure at witnessing their innocent gambols—they see them growing in beauty and in stature, and view their increase in knowledge under their own superintendence—they see that they wear their own resemblance, and they will perpetuate their name. It is this, and not natural instinct that is the cause of parental affection. As a proof we find, that when children are brought up with more distant relations, or even with strangers, those strangers will entertain as strong an affection for the children as their own parents could entertain; while on the other hand, when children have not been brought up at home, parents feel much less affection for them. It is obvious, therefore, that parental affection is not derived from natural instinct, but from intercourse.

In reply to this, I would observe, that I admit that parental

affection is much strengthened by intercourse, and also that intercourse with strangers will often produce a kind of affection as strong as the parental. Every passion of our nature is strengthened by exercise, and when circumstances do not call it into action, the passion will be imperceptible, and will decline. The affection of a mother for her offspring can be accounted for on no principles but by supposing it to be a natural instinctive principle. It may, it is true, be weakened or strengthened by the influence of circumstances. In some rare cases it may be destroyed; but in establishing a general rule, individual instances prove nothing. They are merely exceptions to which all general rules are liable.

But the argument derived from the universality of parental affection to prove it natural may be met in another way. It may be denied that parental affection is universal; and it would be easy to adduce historical facts that seem to countenance this assertion.

Among nearly all the nations of antiquity, parents were accustomed to expose their infant children; that is, they cast them in the highways or by rivers, and there left them to perish, unless any persons might happen to see them and be inclined to adopt them for their own. This was practised by all the states of Greece, except the Thebans, who had an express law to the contrary. According to this law, those parents that had children whom they could not support were required to bring them to the magistrate, and they were brought up at the public expense. Among the other Grecian states, when a child was born, it was laid on the ground before the father—if he took it up, it was preserved—if he did not, it was taken away and exposed. At Sparta, all children were brought, as soon as they were born, to certain magistrates, who decided whether the child should be preserved or destroyed. If they decided upon its destruction, it was thrown down a large cavern appropriated to that purpose. Exposing of infants was practised among the Romans. Romulus prohibited the exposing of sons or of the eldest daughter, and even the younger daughters under three years of age. The Romans and the Egyptians exposed their

children on the banks of rivers; and the Greeks, theirs on the highways. The ancient Germans did not expose their children.

In the present day, the exposure of children is practised by the Hottentots, who leave their children in places frequented by wild beasts. This practice is also followed throughout the empire of China. It is calculated that, in the city of Pekin alone, 9,000 infants are thus annually destroyed, and an equal number in the other cities and places of the empire.

Superstition, too, has made a dreadful havoc among the infant race. The Jews offered their children in sacrifice to Moloch. The Egyptians, the Carthaginians, the Druids in Gaul and in Britain, offered up human sacrifices. Such, too, at one period was the practice of the Greeks. Agamemnon sacrificed his daughter to Diana, when he set out on the expedition against Troy.

The Romans never offered up human victims; but the Roman fathers had the power of life and death over their children, and in some instances this power was exercised.

Now we are told, forsooth, that all this slaughter and havoc among children was made by persons who had an instinctive natural affection for the objects they destroyed.

But although these are facts which cannot be disputed, yet they do not seem to prove that parental affection is not a natural principle of the mind.

In regard to the exposing of children,—this practice arises principally from the difficulty the parents find or anticipate in the rearing of their children. Here the principle of parental affection is counteracted by the principle of self-love. One natural principle counteracts another:—we often find this to be the case. To prove that any passion is an instinctive principle, it is not necessary to prove that it is so strong as to overcome every other principle:—on this ground it could easily be proved that man has no natural principles at all. Even the principle of self-interest, the strongest passion of our nature, has often been counteracted by benevolence, by patriotism, by love, and by parental affection. Perhaps, too, in the present instance, parents may think it

better for their children that they should be put to death than be brought up in all the evils and deprivations of poverty. In this case it is an error of judgment, not an error of the heart.

With reference to the offering of children in sacrifice to idols—here the principle of parental affection is counteracted by the principle of superstition under the garb of religion. Under the influence of this principle, devotees have often sacrificed themselves, and therefore it is not surprising that they should sacrifice their children. But this does not prove that they are destitute of regard either for themselves or their children,—one natural principle is counteracted by another.

An instinctive principle of attachment for its young characterises every class of animals. This principle, however, exists no longer than till the young are able to provide for themselves. To this degree, and no further, does this principle appear to exist in the mind of the savage. In civilized states, the period of education during which the youth is acquiring those qualifications necessary for the performance of his future duties, is much longer than in the savage state: —all this time, he stands in need of the protection and assistance of his parents. The length of time which thus elapses, strengthens the affections, and gives occasion for the calling forth of other feelings, the exercise of which is blended with those which are strictly filial and parental. The attachment between father and children is thus continued in civilized states throughout the whole term of life.

It is an opinion, at first suggested by Hume, and since adopted by Malthus, that the permission of infanticide has a tendency, not to dimish, but to increase population. If parents were not permitted to destroy their children, they would be obliged to rear them,—to rear these children would involve the parents in great poverty and distress,—hence, as in every instance, distress and poverty might be the accompaniments of marriage among the main body of the people—the dread of these evils would prevent people marrying, and the number of marriages would be less. But by permitting

infanticide, marriage becomes general, as the parties are aware that if they should have more children than they can easily support, they may relieve themselves from the evil by exposing them. Though many persons calculate upon this line of conduct beforehand, yet when the children arrive, the interference of parental affection will often prevent their destruction. Thus it is supposed that the practice of exposing children produces a greater number than are destroyed.

We have no instance in history of any nation permitting infanticide with a view of increasing the population of the country, though some nations have employed other means for that purpose. The most ordinary way has been to grant rewards to those who have many children. This plan was adopted at Rome, in the days of Augustus Cæsar. "The married men who had the most children were always preferred, whether in the pursuit or in the exercise of honours. The Consul who had the most numerous offspring was the first who received the fasces, and he had his choice of the provinces;—the Senator who had most children had his name written first in the catalogue of Senators, and was the first in giving his opinion in the senate;—they might even stand sooner than ordinary for an office, because every child gave them a dispensation for a year. If an inhabitant of Rome had three children, he was exempted from all troublesome offices. The free-born woman who had three children, and the freed-woman who had four, passed out of that perpetual tutelage in which they had been held by the ancient laws of Rome. Those who were married and had no children could receive only half the amount of a legacy left them, unless it was by a near relation:—those who were not married could receive nothing."—*Spirit of Laws*, ii. 123.

Among the Hebrews, a numerous offspring was a very desirable object. "Thy wife," said the Hebrew poet, "shall be like a fruitful vine by the side of thy house, thy children like olive branches round about thy table; blessed is he that hath his quiver full of them, he shall speak with the enemy in the gate." When Boaz took his wife, the elders of the city said to him, "The Lord make this young woman like Rachel

and like Leah, which two did build the house of Israel." Those of you who have read the Marriage Service in our Prayer-book (and which of you has not read it?) will recollect that it contains a prayer for a numerous offspring; and there is a positive direction, that if the wife be past child-bearing, the prayer is not to be used. The prayer runs thus:—"We beseech thee, assist with thy blessing these two persons, that they may both be fruitful in procreation of children, and also live together so long in godly love and honesty, that they may see their children Christianly and virtuously brought up."

When we find that in one nation it is necessary to annex honours and rewards to the possession of a large family; and when, in another nation, we find that a large family is, without any civil rewards, an object of desire, it proves that the state of society must be different in these respective countries. The Hebrews were strictly an agricultural nation: never, but in the reign of Solomon, did they pay any great attention to commerce. They lived in a land famed for its fertility, and under a climate where a small portion of food is sufficient for the support of human life. The laws which regulated their inheritances maintained among them a pretty near equality of property; and, as every man had land of his own, but few would let themselves out as labourers to others. A man, then, who had a large family, had additional hands to assist in the field, and, in case of war, he had sons who would fight in his defence. Nor was a large family of daughters viewed with those terrific feelings with which they would be regarded at the present day; on the contrary, it was a source of wealth. Instead of giving a dowry with their daughters, they received one from the husband, though, perhaps, our language would be too strong were we to say that the daughters were literally sold.

In regard to Rome, it must be recollected that these laws were designed for the free Romans,—the denizens of Rome. At the time of Augustus, these Romans bore but little resemblance to the Romans of previous times; they had left their fields and their vineyards to be cultivated by slaves, while they crowded the capital. The introduction of a

luxurious mode of living had rendered the maintenance of a family very expensive; the manners of the women, too, had become very irregular. The Roman men, to avoid this expense, and also to escape the risk of being married to an abandoned woman, declined marrying. The Romans, too, had the privilege of adoption; they could at any time adopt a child as their own, and he would have all the legal privileges due to the child of his adopted father. This might render the Romans more indifferent about marriage, as they could perpetuate their name and family by means of adoption. Besides, the Romans did not receive money when their daughters were married, but, like the moderns, they gave dowries with their daughters. But as the Roman citizens were but a small number compared with the whole of the Roman subjects and slaves, it was necessary they should have families, if they wished to keep the others in subjection. Hence arose the laws for the encouragement of marriage.

At Sparta, on the other hand, they seemed more anxious to keep down rather than increase the number of their citizens. All who were not citizens were slaves;—the helots, or slaves, were the sole cultivators of the soil; they formed the only class of productive labourers. The citizens engaged in no occupation but that of war;—they were the standing army of the state. If the standing army of a nation be disproportionate to its means of supporting it, that nation will become feeble and impoverished;—hence it was found necessary to keep down the standing army of Sparta to that number which the nature of the soil and the labour of the slaves were adequate to maintain. In such a state a large family was not deemed an advantage to the country.

In our own country, a large family is not usually an object of desire; this, however, depends upon the rank and condition of the parties. In the manufacturing districts, where the children are put to work at an early age, people marry very young, and feel no horror at the idea of a numerous family; in the middle ranks of life, where certain enjoyments and appearances are considered as indispensable, the fear of losing caste greatly diminishes the number of marriages.

Among most of the nations of antiquity, the birth of a child was an occasion of festivity, and certain ceremonies were observed. From these ceremonies, it appears that the birth of a son was always regarded as a more auspicious event than the birth of a daughter. Among a martial people, courage and physical strength would, of course, acquire the chief regard;—a son, who would be capable of defending his country, or of invading that of the enemy, would be more highly esteemed than a daughter, who had occasion of being defended; a son would perpetuate the name and dignity of the family, and perhaps increase its honour by his own actions, but a daughter passed into the family of her husband, and her virtues, however illustrious, were not so open to public observation, nor so likely to be known to future ages. In case the parents should be involved in distress, a son is more likely to have the means of affording them support than a daughter, and will have a more absolute command over the means he may possess. The greater evils to which daughters are exposed require the exercise of a more constant vigilance, and, of course, lead to greater anxiety on the part of the parents. Hence it is, that most parents desire to have sons rather than daughters; hence, among the nations who expose their children, daughters are more frequently exposed than sons. But although daughters are in these respects inferior to sons, yet there are other respects in which they are superior;—from being more in the company of their parents, they have a stronger filial affection, and can perform a variety of kind offices from which sons are excluded.

After children are born, if not before, it is an important object to fix their names. In the early history of all nations, —the Egyptians, the Chaldæans, the Medes, the Greeks, the Romans, the Gauls, the Germans, and the Britons,—each individual had only one name;—this name was often suggested by some circumstance connected with the birth of the child. We find by Mungo Park's Travels that this is now the practice of the nations in the interior of Africa. In the sacred writings we often meet with instances of this kind. These names were often expressive of a wish for the future

welfare of the child, and were a sort of short prayer;—hence, both in Hebrew and in Greek, the word God was often a component part of a name. Some of their names were expressive of excellent qualities. The ancient Britons appear to have taken their names from colours.

But most nations, as they became populous and wealthy, adopted the use of surnames. Among the Romans, each individual had a proper name, or, as we should call it (though very improperly), a Christian name, and two surnames. The Romans, like all other nations, were, in the first stage of their existence, divided into families, tribes, or clans; each individual, then, took for a surname the name of the chief of the clan to which he belonged; but as the clan or family became very numerous, they afterwards took another surname, denoting the family or branch of the clan from which they had descended. Thus the names of the Orator Cicero were, Marcus Tullius Cicero: Marcus was his proper, or Christian name; Cicero was his family name; Tullius was the name of the clan, or tribe, of which the family of Cicero was a branch. The first was called the *prenomen*, the second (Tully), the *nomen*, and the third (Cicero), the *cognomen*.

The ancient Hebrews never appear to have adopted surnames; but in their historical works they mention the name of the ancestors of the individual whose actions they record, as,—David, the son of Jesse, of the tribe of Judah.

Among the Highlanders, Mac means a son; hence, when surnames were first introduced among them, they prefixed Mac to the name of their father; thus Macdonald denotes the son of Donald. By the old Irish, the same relation was expressed by O, hence O'Neal signifies the son of Neal. The Saxons added the word Son to the end of their father's name; hence came Johnson, Jackson, Williamson, Richardson, &c. But the greater number of surnames were adopted at the caprice of the individual. Several of the princes, both of France and England, have had surnames derived from their personal qualities, as Charles the Bald, William Rufus, &c.

The Hebrews, the Greeks, and the Romans had public registers for their children. The Hebrews were always

remarkable for their attention to their registers, and could trace the genealogy of any individual of their nation back to Jacob, their general parent. Among the Greeks and the Romans every child that was intended to be preserved was required to be registered within thirty days from its birth. A complete register of births, marriages, and deaths may serve so many useful purposes that almost all civilized nations have made some attempts towards keeping one. It is greatly to be regretted that, in consequence of the mode in which these registers have been kept, they are of very little use. A statement of the number of christenings and burials that take place within the bills of mortality is annually published; but no advantage can be derived from this statement. It contains an account of those christenings and burials only which are connected with the Established Church; whereas there are numerous dissenting burial-grounds, and almost every dissenting minister baptizes the children of his congregation, and there are some classes of dissenters, such as the Anabaptists and the Quakers, who never baptize their children at all. It is obvious, therefore, that even this local register is imperfect, and, of course, useless. A perfect register of all the births (not christenings), marriages, and deaths, with the age and occupation of the respective parties, would be of incalculable service in many points of view;—it would enable a statesman to ascertain what number of men within certain ages existed in the country, and, consequently, what portion might safely be drafted off for military service;—it would reduce the system of life insurance and of annuities to a perfect certainty. We should be able to discover the in-influence of certain trades or professions in shortening or lengthening human life, and hence be able to form more complete rules for clubs, benefit societies, and widows' societies; we should also be able to ascertain the number of children born, upon an average, from each marriage, and be able to acquire a body of information useful to the philosopher, the statesman, the physician, and the philanthropist. A motion was once made in the House of Commons for the purpose of obtaining such a register, but as the measure was not a

party measure, little notice was taken of it, and it was not supported.*

There are few things in which nations have differed from each other more than they have in their forms of inheritance. As daughters, when married, pass into the family of their husbands, while the sons maintain the dignity of the family from which they sprang, it is not surprising that, among all nations, the fathers should wish to give to their sons a larger portion of their property than to their daughters. It has been said that this makes no difference either to the daughters or the sons, as this inequality is rectified by the circumstance of marriage; for if a brother has a larger portion of the father's property than his sister, he will marry a wife whose property is less than his own; and if a sister has less property than her brother, yet she will marry a husband whose property is proportionately large: thus the inequality between the inheritances of brothers and sisters is removed. Even if the daughters were sold, it would make no difference; for if a father enriched his family by selling his daughters, he would have to give larger portions to his sons, to enable them to buy wives: thus equality would be restored. It must be acknowledged, this view would be correct, if no women were imported from other nations, and if all parents were to have an equal number of sons and daughters; and as the ancient Hebrews had but little intercourse with surrounding nations, and did not intermarry with them, the circumstance of receiving money for their daughters did not, perhaps, much deteriorate the condition of the Hebrew wives; but when, as in Turkey, fresh importations of women from Georgia and Circassia are constantly arriving, this circumstance must degrade the condition of even those women who are born of respectable Turkish parents.

The custom of giving larger portions of property to sons than to daughters in our own country is probably pernicious. The sons have the means of increasing their property by their own industry, which the daughters have not: this

* This was written in the year 1826, before the passing of the Registration Act.

custom encourages the sons to remain unmarried, and is very oppressive to those females who remain unmarried, as their enjoyments must necessarily be less than those who are married. On the other hand, the operation of this custom is beneficial to those parents who have many daughters, and who can, consequently, give them but small portions; as by giving large portions to the sons, they are enabled to advance them higher in the world, and their sisters share their honours, and thus have opportunities of forming higher connections.

As it was the custom of ancient nations for kings to command the armies, females were excluded from the succession;—yet we read of Semiramis, Queen of Nineveh, and Cleopatra, Queen of Egypt. In some countries of Europe this law is strictly enforced, and is called the Salique law. Our Edward the Third endeavoured to lay aside this law in France, and laid claim to the throne of that country; but, fortunately for England, his attempts were not successful. The Salique law is observed throughout Germany, but not in our own country.

Among many agricultural nations, the whole of whose wealth consists in land, it has been customary to divide their land equally among the sons;—such was the case with the Romans, though in after-times they disposed of their property by will. The right of primogeniture, by which the eldest son has the whole of the estate, and the rest of the children nothing, does not appear to have been known to ancient times. Adam Smith considers such a practice to be adapted to a state of turbulence, when the possession of a large estate was necessary to security, for in those seasons, were a large estate to be divided into seven or eight portions, each would be too small to resist aggression, and the whole might be wrested from the family. The forms of inheritance should, however, be analogous to the form of government established in a country; and in a form of government which embraces the aristocratic principle, it appears necessary to have the law of entail and the right of primogeniture, to a certain extent at least, in order to maintain the aristocratical part of the constitution. The younger branches of the family cannot

complain that they are treated with injustice by the law of primogeniture, for, were it not for this law, their father would not be in possession of the estate from which they are excluded.

In most ancient states, the fathers had great power over their children. Among the Hebrews, if the parents declared to the magistrates that their son was a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber, and that he would not obey their voice, he was stoned to death. The Romans had the power of putting their children to death, and some of them exercised this power. A Roman father might compel his daughter to repudiate her husband, though he himself had consented to the marriage. There was, however, a civil process, by which a father could go before a magistrate and renounce his authority over his children; and this was often done when the son was about to become a candidate for any office in the state.

Parents love their children more than children love their parents;—this is a wise arrangement; for as parents, in the ordinary course of nature, will die first, their removal will cause less distress to the survivors. Power in the hands of parents is not often abused; but children who are independent of their parents usually manifest but a small degree of filial affection. In high life, where the estate is entailed, how often is the eldest son at variance with his father! At Athens, the laws compelled a son to support his father, unless the father had neglected to teach him a trade.

Brothers and sisters have a unity of interest and of affection when they are young, and are often at variance when they are grown up. In reading the history of Eastern nations, we often meet with instances of a brother putting some scores of his brethren to death; but it is hardly just to consider this as displaying a want of fraternal affection. In countries where polygamy is allowed, every child is taught from his very infancy to consider the other sons of his father as enemies and as rivals. To the sons of his mother, his own brothers, he feels a strong affection, but towards the others, he bears a most cordial hatred, and they hate him and hate

each other. Hence, when a contest arises about the throne of their father, the successful competitor, from maxims of policy as well as feelings of vengeance, puts all the other competitors to death. In our day, the association of brothers and sisters in the same family tends to improve the character of both; the brothers acquire some degree of the refinement and tenderness of his sisters, and the sisters acquire some of the knowledge and firmness of the brothers. Those females who have brothers will make the best wives, and those men who have sisters will make the best husbands.

Having considered the relation between husband and wife, and that subsisting between parents and children, I shall now proceed to notice the relation that exists between master and servant.

The relation between masters and servants, such as it exists among ourselves in the present day, was by no means so general among the nations of antiquity. In the ruder stages of society all men are nearly equal; their wealth is small; they have no arts nor science; no manufactures nor commerce; agriculture is their chief employment. But accustomed as they have been in their predatory excursions to share the booty, they make a similar division of the land on which they make their settlements, and each man cultivates his own freehold. As their wants are confined to necessaries, few have so large a portion as to require the assistance of others, and no man could labour in the field of another without neglecting his own. Similar to this, I apprehend, was the condition of the Jews who settled in Palestine, of the Greek colonies that came from Egypt, and of the various nations or tribes that existed in Italy about the time of the foundation of Rome.

In those nations which had become rich by conquest and civilized by the arts, the office of servants was supplied by slaves. Slaves worked in the field—slaves waited in the house—slaves produced the articles of manufacture. Thus we find that the three grand departments of labour—the place of agricultural labourers, domestic servants, and artizans—were supplied by

slaves. And when slavery is once established in a country, the free men, however poor they may be, will rarely descend to hire themselves out as labourers;—they think it a degradation to do the work of slaves. Hence it was that the Roman citizens who had become poor, instead of applying themselves to labour, were accustomed to receive rations from the public treasury.

Still, among the nations of antiquity, there must have been many hired servants. Jacob appears to have been the hired servant of Laban; and frequent allusion is made to "hire' and to "wages" in the ancient writings.

A servant is a seller of labour—a master is a buyer of labour—wages is the price of labour. The price of labour, like that of every other commodity, will be regulated by the proportion between the supply and the demand. When the labourers or sellers of labour are but few, and the masters or buyers of labour are many, the competition among the buyers will raise wages; that is, the price of labour. It is not likely there was much competition among the masters of ancient times for free labourers, because those who wanted hands could go to the market and buy slaves. As no man would give for free labour a higher price than that at which he might obtain the labour of slaves, the price of labour was proportionally low.

The rate of wages is influenced by another circumstance—that is, the expense of providing the necessary means of subsistence for the labourer. Where the expense of living is low, people will work for less money than where it is high. The common rate of mere labour—that is, of unskilled labour—will never be much beyond what is necessary to procure the comfortable means of subsistence. The expense of living must have been very little in ancient times, compared with the present among ourselves. In warm climates, but a small portion of food is essential to the support of the human body, and yet it is in these climates that the earth brings forth with the greatest fertility:—hence these lands are very populous; the people live, too, chiefly on vegetables. Throughout China and India, they live principally on rice. A Hebrew

writer, in describing a profligate, designates him as an "eater of flesh." The clothes of the Hebrews, Greeks, and the Romans were nearly the same for the common people; they were made of wool washed white; linen and cotton were unknown—and the use of silk was for ages confined to the nobles. The fashion never changed—a suit of ciothes, or as they were called, "a change of garments," was made in such a manner that it suited any person, whatever might be his size. Hence, the clothes of the parents were worn by their children, and no garment was ever thrown aside until it was worn out. In the warm climates in which those nations whose actions have been recorded by historians principally dwelt, a slight building to afford shelter from the periodical rains was sufficient for a house. They were made chiefly of bricks dried in the sun, and had usually but one or two apartments. The expense of living, therefore, of the common people among the ancients being so light, the rate of wages would be proportionally small.

Again—most of the ancient nations were purely agricultural nations. Such a people are always remarkable for the simplicity of their manners, the fewness of their wants, and consequently for their low rate of wages. In a country composed principally of agriculturists, people do not hire men to make a profit of their labour, as they do in manufacturing districts. The ancients cultivated their lands to provide food for their households. It is not until manufactures are established, either in that or the neighbouring country, that farming becomes a business, and is carried on as a branch of trade. With the exception of those nations who lived on the coasts of the Mediterranean sea, all the ancient nations were agricultural; hence wages would be exceedingly low. Even among those people which were commercial and manufacturing, it is probable the wages were not much higher, as these nations had slaves whom they compelled to work in their manufactories.

The labourers of ancient times probably lived in the house of their masters, and received their board as part of their wages, in the same way as our domestic servants. Indeed,

this was the plan almost universally followed in the agricultural districts of this country about thirty years ago; but the masters now find it cheaper to pay the whole of the wages in money, though this plan is probably not so well for the labourer.

We do not read in history any of those restrictions upon the transfer of labour from one employment to another that are known in modern times. We read nothing of a statute of apprenticeship—we read nothing of combination laws, nor of attempts to fix the price of labour—nor of parish settlements.

The statute of apprenticeship was passed in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and enacted that no person who had not served an apprenticeship of seven years should be employed as a journeyman. The legal expositors of our laws restricted the operation of this act to corporation towns, and to those trades which were established at the time the act was passed. But this act has recently been repealed. It operated as an injury to the masters, who could not procure so many labourers as they wanted, nor at the rate they might otherwise have obtained them. It was an injury to the workmen, who could not transfer their industry to any kindred branch of trade, although they could obtain no work in their own trade. It was an injury to the apprentices, who were induced to be idle, knowing that the profits of their work would belong to the master. It was an injury to the public, as they were compelled to pay a higher price for the commodities they purchased, and to maintain in poverty and idleness many men who might otherwise have obtained employment.

The combination laws were passed to prevent combinations among the workmen. After a long trial of their efficacy, they were found ineffectual for the purpose, and were therefore repealed. The conduct of the workmen in various parts of the country immediately after the repeal of these laws was by no means such as those who procured the repeal either expected or approved.

Numerous laws have been passed in different periods of our history, to fix the rate of wages;—these laws have, no

doubt, been often obeyed, but oftener, probably, they have been evaded. They are founded on mistaken views of the principles of political economy. If the price of labour is to be fixed by law, the price of every other commodity might be fixed in the same way ; and what confusion would this introduce into all the departments of commerce !

We read nothing in ancient history of parochial settlements. In no nation with whose records we are acquainted has there been any regulation analogous to our poors'-rate. The duty of relieving the poor has been enjoined by almost every kind of religion which has ever been established, but has not been enforced by civil penalties. Every poor Roman citizen, however, received a certain sum from the public treasury—this money was not raised by taxing the other citizens, who were at this time free from all taxes, but was the tribute paid by the conquered provinces. In the states of Greece, the poor were free citizens as well as the rich ; and as those states possessed all the blessedness of universal suffrage, the poor sometimes made use of this privilege as a means of depriving the rich of their property, and sharing it among themselves.

The most amiable feelings of our nature, when perverted, become the most pernicious. Thus the feeling of humanity, when unrestrained by prudence, has inflicted immense evil upon mankind. To this we owe monastic institutions and other benevolent societies, which, for the sake of the poor would reduce the whole world to poverty.

The poor-rate system of England,* though upon the whole beneficial, has been extremely abused. One of the greatest of these abuses is the custom of paying wages out of the poor-rate. This practice prevails chiefly in agricultural districts, and it ought to receive the severest condemnation. Some of the masters in our manufacturing districts used to keep shops, and pay their men in goods ;—these shops were called Tommy-shops ; but they are now suppressed by Act of Parliament.

* This was written in 1826, and refers to the old poor-law. The new poor-law was introduced in the year 1834.

Slavery is of two kinds—national and domestic. National slavery is when one nation is enslaved by another, and is compelled to pay tribute, and receive laws from the conqueror; but when the individuals of the enslaved people are not the private property of any individuals among the conquerors. The other state of slavery is domestic slavery, and in this case the slaves are the private property of individuals. Both of these kinds of slavery are distinct from political slavery, which is the condition of those nations who have a despotic and tyrannical government. In political slavery the people are not enslaved by another nation, but by their own government. It is not either political or national slavery that I am now going to consider, but domestic slavery.

Domestic Slavery has existed from almost the earliest periods of the world. We are unacquainted with those circumstances by which it was first introduced; but we know the means by which it has been continued. The ancient Egyptians and the Babylonians had their slaves. Nebuchadnezzar reduced several nations to slavery, and sent the prisoners as captives to Babylon. Though, perhaps, all these persons were not domestic slaves. All the states of Greece had their slaves. At Sparta the slaves were treated with great severity. At Athens the citizens amounted to 20,000, and the slaves to 400,000. The accuracy of these numbers has been questioned. Mr. Brougham,* in his Colonial Policy, maintains that the number 20,000 did not include the whole free population, but only the number of citizens capable of bearing arms. It has been calculated that the population of the Roman empire was one hundred and twenty million souls, of which sixty millions were slaves. But no dependence can be placed on such calculations with reference to ancient nations. The Hebrews had slaves; but as the law required that all the slaves should be liberated every seventh year, the slaves could never be very numerous.

The causes of slavery have been various. 1. Insolvency.—In some states a man unable to pay his debts was allowed to

* Lord Brougham.

sell himself, his wife, and his children, in order to satisfy his creditors. This was the case at Rome and in India. 2. Polygamy.—If all the great men of any nation have many wives, and yet the common people continue to marry, there must be an importation of women from other nations. Hence the parents of Circassia and Georgia educate their daughters for the express purpose of selling them as slaves to Turkish dealers. 3. War.—This has been the most fruitful cause of slavery. Prisoners of war were, among ancient nations, always sold as slaves. This sometimes rendered wars less destructive. The Romans, when they had gained a battle, were more anxious to take their enemies prisoners than to put them to death. By taking them prisoners, and selling them as slaves, the soldiers would acquire a larger booty. Hence the civil wars which the Romans carried on against each other were the most destructive. No gain was to be obtained by making prisoners. Neither party would think of making a Roman citizen a slave.

Slaves were of two kinds: those who were born in the house, and those who were bought with money. The Orientals highly valued those slaves who had been born and brought up in their houses. They often held high offices in the family. They were stewards and managers, and sometimes even married the daughters of their masters. The Romans, however, never paid any attention to the rearing of slaves. Their wars rendered slaves numerous, and the ample supply must have reduced the price. Hence it was cheaper to buy a slave than to rear one. The slaves bought with money were used by the Orientals chiefly in field labour. The domestic and the field slaves differed from each other as much as our livery servants differ from the agricultural labourers, and probably more so.

I shall not enter into any laboured argument to prove that one man has no right to enslave another. A man who wants arguments to convince him of this is unworthy of breathing the air of liberty. Happily, it is not necessary to prove this in an assembly of Britons. Though, when an evil system of slavery has existed for several centuries, there may be a

difference of opinion as to the most efficacious way of removing the evil, yet no one in the present day will defend slavery in the abstract. If, however, any class of the commercial world is so besotted as to believe that to kidnap and enslave a man is consistent with the principles of justice, or that slavery is better than liberty, let them no longer refer us to the country gentlemen among agricultural classes, for subjects whom we may banter upon their selfishness and stupidity.

"Were I," says Montesquieu, "to vindicate our right to make slaves of the negroes, these should be my arguments:

"The Europeans, having extirpated the Americans, were obliged to make slaves of the Africans for clearing such vast tracts of lands.

"Sugar would be too dear if the plants which produced it were cultivated by any other than slaves.

"These creatures are all over black, and with such a flat nose that they can scarcely be pitied.

"It is hardly to be believed that God, who is a wise Being, should place a soul, especially a good soul, in such a black, ugly body.

"It is impossible for us to suppose these creatures to be men; because, allowing them to be men, a suspicion would follow that we ourselves are not Christians."

In every age slavery has produced mischievous effects. In the first place, it debases the mind of the slave himself. It was asserted by Homer, that when Jupiter made a man a slave he took away half his soul. The stupidity of the negro slaves is universally admitted—indeed, *that* stupidity has been adduced as a reason why they should be reduced to slavery; it is, however, their slavery and their imperfect civilization which is the cause of their mental degradation. Europeans who have been reduced to slavery by the Mahometan powers on the coast of the Mediterranean have, in a course of years, exhibited similar symptoms of mental imbecility. The present state of St. Domingo is a proof that there are at least some negroes whose intellectual energies are not to be despised, even by Europeans.

Slavery produces an evil effect upon the lands cultivated

by them. Historians assert that the agriculture of Italy declined after the Romans had deserted their fields, and left the cultivation of them to slaves. The different lands of Europe are now infinitely better cultivated than they were under the feudal system, when the labourers were slaves.

Slavery produces an evil effect upon the character of those who are free. In all slave countries the people are distinguished by their idleness,—men will not work when they can obtain other people to work for them. The idle habits of the Eastern nations are produced, probably, in part from the number of slaves who minister to their wants. Idleness is often the result of pride. The Romans were industrious before they had slaves—even their greatest men laboured hard at the plough; but after all the most laborious branches of industry had been assigned to slaves, it was esteemed disgraceful for a free Roman to engage in those despised occupations; hence it was that so many of the common people were under the necessity of receiving support from the public treasury.

I might trace still farther the effects of slavery, in producing an irritability of temper among the men, and an ignorance of household affairs among the women; and also in producing a general relaxation of the laws of morality, both among the free people and the slaves.

The treatment of slaves has been different in different countries. It has been asserted that slaves are much better treated in those countries which have a despotic government than in those which have free political institutions. Under a despotic government, as all the people are political slaves, the difference between them and the domestic slaves is not so great. The chain of slavery is not felt to be so galling; for nothing is more afflicting than to be tantalized with the sight of a good we cannot enjoy. A government purely despotic regards all its subjects as equal, and it does not accord with its policy to raise one class of the people much above the other; hence we find that Joseph was raised from the condition of a slave to be governor of Egypt. In Turkey, the prime minister is often raised from the condition

of slaves. The famous body of Janizaries, which has recently been suppressed, after having maintained for ages the chief power of the state, was composed of slaves who had been bought and educated for this purpose.

It has been asserted, that the degree of severity with which different nations have treated their slaves, has always been in inverse proportion to the degree of liberty those nations possessed. In all cases, this remark may not be just. At Athens, for instance, the form of government was more democratical than that of either Sparta or Rome; yet the slaves were much better treated than at either of those places. On the other hand, it is certain that, under the Roman emperors, the slaves were much better treated than under the republic. In modern times, too, the slaves of Spain and of Portugal have been much better treated than those of England and of Holland.

Montesquieu observes, that a frugal and laborious people generally use their slaves more kindly than those who are above labour. He states, that the primitive Romans lived, worked, and ate with their slaves, and behaved towards them with great justice and humanity; but when the Romans aggrandized themselves, when the slaves were no longer the companions of their labour, they treated them with the greatest severity. In defiance, however, of this high authority, this principle must be rejected. We are not warranted by the facts of history in affirming that industrious nations treat their slaves with greater mildness than idle nations do. The Athenian citizens were the idlest people upon earth, yet they behaved well towards their slaves. The slaves of England and of Holland, which are the most industrious nations in Europe, are not so well treated as the slaves of Spain and Portugal, who are the most idle.* A reference to the earlier and later periods of the Roman republic would seem to countenance Montesquieu's opinion; but it should be remembered that the Romans were more idle still under the emperors, and yet the condition of the slaves was then considerably ameliorated.

* See note, p. 458.

It may be alleged, too, that those nations who are of a gay, cheerful disposition, treat their slaves better than those nations who are remarkable for their gravity and taciturnity. The Athenians were the gayest and most frivolous people in the world; the Spartans were Stoics; and the Romans were distinguished by gravity and taciturnity; the French are gay and cheerful; the English and Dutch silent and thoughtful; and the treatment of their slaves by these respective nations have corresponded to their natural dispositions. On the other hand, the Spaniards are remarkable for gravity, yet their slaves have been treated with mildness.

In those countries where the main body of the slaves are reared by their masters, they are better treated than where they are imported. Thus the Romans, when their wars constantly supplied them with fresh numbers of slaves, treated them with great severity. But when their empire had extended to its utmost bounds, fresh slaves could not so easily be obtained; hence, the price must have risen, especially as the increase of luxury must have augmented the demand for slaves. It might then be worth while to rear slaves, and the master had an interest in their health and comfort. In Virginia and the whole states of America, where the slaves are all reared, they are much better treated than in New Orleans and the newly-settled countries, where slaves are obtained by purchase from the other states.

We have no certain information as to the way in which slaves were treated by the ancient Babylonians, Medes, or Egyptians. At Athens there was a law, that if any slave were used ill, he might demand to be sold to another master: this must have operated as a check upon cruelty. Among the Jews, every slave was liberated at the seventh year; in case a master struck out the eye or the tooth of his slave, the slave was free. The Romans treated their slaves with great severity; they had power of life and death over them, as well as over their children. At one period it was the law, that when a master was murdered, all the slaves under the same roof, or in any place so near the house as to be within the hearing of a man's voice, should, without distinction, be

condemned to die. Those who in this case sheltered a slave, in order to save him, were punished as murderers.

The introduction of luxury among the Romans was beneficial to the slaves. As no free Roman would occupy a menial post, the offices in the houses of the wealthy citizens were all filled with slaves—the stewards, butlers, confectioners, and others, were all slaves. An educated slave capable of discharging these high offices was worth a considerable sum of money; and Crassus is said to have obtained his immense wealth by educating his slaves, and then selling them at a high price. Slaves sometimes practised as physicians; a proof that they were well treated, and that their masters placed high confidence in their integrity.

Under the feudal system, the slaves were attached to the soil. They were not sold from one estate to another, nor liable to be separated from their families at the caprice or interest of their masters. But mitigated as was this form of slavery, the slaves often ran away; and it was enacted, if the slave concealed himself from his master for a twelvemonth and a day, he was free. This law was for the purpose of encouraging corporation towns.

To be a slave—to be bought and sold—to have his wife or children taken from him at the pleasure of his master—is so degrading to the feelings of every man, that slavery cannot exist unattended with cruelty and danger. To deny this would be to deny the strongest facts of history. I challenge any man to take the map of the world and to place his finger upon any portion of it, and to say, here is a country in which slavery existed, and yet in this country the slave was not treated with harshness by the master, nor did the master entertain any fear of the slave. The masters were conscious they had violated the claims of justice and humanity, and they dreaded revenge. It was their fear that occasioned their cruelty, and their cruelty, again, added fresh fuel to their fears. What numbers both of citizens and slaves were slain in Rome during the servile war; and what cruelties were inflicted for the purpose of striking terror into the minds of the slaves!

A slave who had become free was called a freedman: this was usually an act of clemency on the part of the master. At one time so many slaves were set free that a law was passed to limit the number. The citizens had two motives to induce them to emancipate their slaves. The one was ambition: every slave, as soon as he was liberated, became a Roman citizen, and entitled to vote at the assemblies of the people; hence, those citizens who were aiming at power could liberate their slaves, and thus secure an additional number of votes. The second motive was avarice: every free citizen who was poor received a certain portion of corn from the public granary; persons then sometimes gave freedom to their slaves, that these slaves might receive the gratuity of corn, part of which was given to the master.

The West India question is so intimately connected with the present subject, that it would be deemed extraordinary if I were to pass it unnoticed. These slaves differ from all the slaves of antiquity. In the first place, they or their ancestors have been kidnapped from their native country. Among the Jews, the Greeks, and the Romans, man-stealing was prohibited; by the law of Moses, it was punished with death. All the slaves of antiquity were either sold by their parents or by their creditors, or were criminals made slaves for their crimes, or were captives taken in war. Though slavery was universally prevalent, we find no instance on record of any set of men who made it a trade to kidnap men and then sell them; nor any one pagan country in which such a practice was permitted by law. Another peculiarity of negro slavery is, that the slaves are of a different-coloured skin from their owners. Among the ancients, the complexion of the master and the slave was the same; in his external appearance, a slave at either Athens or Rome could not be distinguished from a citizen. It was once proposed in the Roman senate that the slaves should be compelled to wear a peculiar kind of dress, to distinguish them from the free men. But this motion was rejected, on the ground that it would make the slaves acquainted with their numbers, and it might facilitate plots and seditions against the state. When a slave was

made free, he was in no respect different from a citizen, and was liable to no reflection upon his former condition. But the European finds the African "guilty of a skin not coloured like his own," and hence he proudly imagines he must be inferior to himself. A black slave is known by his colour to be a slave, and even if he obtains his freedom, he is still a marked man. The whites will not associate, will not eat or drink with him, will not employ him to work for them; hence it is that the freed negroes in some of our West India islands, being shunned by the white inhabitants, are often worse off than the slaves.

The two parties who are engaged in controversy upon the West India question, are the abolitionists and the planters. The former insist upon the abolition of slavery; the latter resist the abolition, or contend that, if the abolition takes place, they ought to be indemnified for the property they have invested in the purchase of slaves.

The abolitionists contend that the slaves are treated with cruelty by the planters, and the planters deny the fact. It is difficult for us to decide upon disputed facts. We can, however, collect those facts which are admitted on all sides, and we can obtain as correct information in regard to the laws of the colonies as though we were actually seated at Jamaica. We find that, by law, the slave may be urged to his labour by a cart-whip, and that, till very lately, female slaves might be treated in the same manner. We find that, by law, a slave may be separated from his family, and sold to a separate owner; and the different members of his family may be separated in the same way. We find that, by law, no slave can give evidence in a court of justice against a white man; so that, if a white man should murder a black in the presence of 500 blacks, he cannot be punished. We find that, by law, a slave may be branded or marked with the name of his master, as a punishment for his offences. Now these are the laws. We have not here to decide upon contradictory assertions. These are the laws. Now, these laws are acted upon, or they are not: if they are acted upon, the negroes must be wretched, and the laws ought to be altered; if these laws are

not acted upon, they are useless, and ought to be repealed; hence, whether these laws are acted upon or not, they ought to be repealed. It would be difficult for the anti-abolitionists to extricate themselves from the horns of this dilemma.

In addition to these remarks upon the laws, the abolitionists affirm that the manners connected with slavery are prodnctive of misery; they affirm that, until lately, if not at present, no attention is paid to their religious instruction; that they have no exemption from labour on a Sunday; that marriage is by no means general; but that the slaves live together in promiscuous intercourse; and, moreover, that the slaves are, on many estates, treated with severity and cruelty.

The abolitionists also affirm that negroes brought from Africa are still imported into our West India islands, in defiance of the laws to the contrary; and that the slave-trade cannot be effectully abolished but by the abolition of slavery.

The abolitionists also contend that slave-labour is more expensive than free-labour, in proof of which they refer to the testimony of Adam Smith, and of the majority of our political economists; they appeal also to the fact, that West India sugar cannot stand a competition with East India sugar, but is obliged to have a monopoly of the market by means of exclusive privileges.

Hence it is that abolitionists affirm that the people of this country are paying several millions per annum more for the products of the West Indies than the sum for which they could obtain similar commodities from other quarters.

The abolitionists affirm also that the system of slavery endangers the safety of the West India islands, as the slaves are ever ripe for insurrection; and, in case of a war, would probably join an enemy who might invade the islands: whereas, were those slaves to become free peasants, they would be the best defenders of the islands, and might even be the means of invading, with success, any country in which negro slavery existed.

The abolitionists affirm, moreover, that there is no natural difference between the intellectual powers of the blacks and the whites, and that the negroes are fully capable of per-

forming the duties of citizens, and of discharging the offices of civil society; in proof of which they refer to the island of St. Domingo, and the settlements at Sierra Leone.

It would be difficult to overthrow so powerful a chain of argument as this. The planters, as a body, do not defend the equity or justice of slavery; but they contend that they or their ancestors invested their money in the purchase of slaves under the sanction of an Act of Parliament; and hence if the slaves are to be liberated, they ought to be indemnified for their loss; that as the injustice was perpetrated by the whole nation, the planters alone ought not to be punished for the sins of the country.

This is the bulwark of the planters' cause: it is the only proposition on that side of the question worthy of consideration. As to the attempts which have been made to prove the justice of reducing men to slavery, or the assertions that slavery is better than freedom, or the alarming predictions, that if slavery were abolished, sugar would be dearer, or the affected sneers and the harsh expressions cast at saints and fanatics, these are altogether unworthy of notice, and are, no doubt, treated with contempt, even by those in whose cause this line of conduct has been pursued. But the question of indemnity is a question worthy of inquiry.

This is a question that does not appear to fall within the province of a Philosophical Lecture on History. How far a person who lays out his money, on the supposition that an Act of Parliament will continue in force, is justified in asking indemnity in case that act is repealed, is a question I shall not now examine. But let the question be decided which way it may, it does not affect the main proposition, as to the moral justice and political expediency of abolishing slavery. Every principle of equity, interest, and humanity, calls loudly for this. In public, as well as in private affairs, honesty is the best policy. Whatever is morally wrong can never be politically right; and he who denies liberty to others does not himself deserve to be free.*

* The reader will recollect that the above was written in the year 1826, several years before the abolition of slavery by the British Government. Twenty millions were voted by Parliament as indemnity.

LECTURE III.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF POLITICAL HISTORY.

In my former lectures I have considered the Philosophy of Geographical History and the Philosophy of Domestic History. We have traced the influence of geographical circumstances upon individual character, and we have considered the union of individuals into families. We will now rise from families to nations, and will trace those principles which may be learned from a contemplation of the events of political history.

Amidst the numerous questions which the ingenuity of mankind has raked together for discussion is the following: Is the study of history or that of biography the most instructive?

In behalf of biography it is alleged, that it is far more interesting to the feelings of the generality of mankind. The biographer presents before us an individual character. Upon this the mind can fasten with fixed attention. We enter into his feelings, we watch his progress, and are anxious about his fate. Whereas in the study of history the mind is bewildered with a variety of persons and objects in which it feels but little concern. So well aware are the writers of novels of the effect of individuality that their subject is always an individual whose actions are detailed with minuteness, and whose feelings are described with pathos and sensibility. The exhibition of individual character, too, enables us to improve our studies of human nature. The public actions of a man furnish but a very imperfect test of his real character. In public life every man acts that character which is marked out for him by the concurrence of circumstances. He assumes the garb and pronounces the shibboleth of his party. All the public men of the same party have the same character. In questions of party-feeling they are all nearly alike, and co-operative in advocating the same measures. But the study of biography will teach us that there is a wide difference between their

individual character; that the motives by which they are actuated are various; and that there is a wide difference in the particular objects at which they aim. It belongs to biography to correct those errors into which we might fall by the study of history. History presents us with the view of a hero returning in triumph from the victorious field. His head is bound with myrtle, and he is drawn in state through the city in a splendid car. Before him are carried the spoils of victory, and he is followed by a long train of illustrious captives who have been compelled to submit to the thunder of his arms. The streets are strewed with flowers of the sweetest fragrance. As soon as he passes the triumphal arch, music pours forth her notes; beauty exhibits her softest attractions; poetry attunes her harp; and eloquence utters the strongest language in his praise. Even religion rushes to the temple and offers up fresh sacrifices to the gods for conferring upon the nation such a hero. Ah! who in such a case would not be happy! How calculated is the exhibition of such an object to awaken the feelings of envy and ambition! But let biography introduce us to the secret apartment of this exalted idol—let us become acquainted with the thoughts of his heart, the working of his mind—and our envy will often be changed into compassion. Even when the objects exhibited in history are worthy of admiration and of imitation, still they cannot be universally imitated. The exhibition of such characters may be useful to kings and statesmen, but the generality of mankind perceive no point of resemblance to themselves, and will never be placed in circumstances in which they will have an opportunity of copying the virtues of the character, of whose actions they are presented a record by history. Whereas the records of biography—the personal and domestic virtues of individuals—these come home to every man's bosom, and are capable of universal imitation.

Still we must contend for the study of history. It is history which makes us acquainted with those grand and lofty principles on which depends the happiness of millions. It is history which exhibits those sublime spectacles of patriots, monarchs,

legislators, and philanthropists labouring for the public good. It is history that exhibits the evils of war, tyranny, injustice, and oppression; and it is history that exhibits the influence of knowledge, virtue, commerce, and industry upon the character and fate of nations. By the study of biography we may become virtuous, but we must study history if we wish also to be useful. Nor are the lessons derived from history adapted exclusively for the use of public characters. A nation may be considered as a large family, and those circumstances which tend to exalt or degrade, to enrich or impoverish a nation, must have a proportionate influence upon individuals. Ambition, contention, injustice, and extortion exist in private life as well as in public affairs; and by learning those maxims, the observance of which is essential to national greatness, we acquire the knowledge of those principles which are useful in the regulation of our individual conduct.

The theory which assumes that men were first separate and independent beings, and that, being convinced of the advantages of union, they made a sort of social compact, or bargain, in consequence of which they formed large societies, or nations, is wholly unsupported by the testimony of history. With the early history of Babylon and Egypt we are unacquainted; but with regard to those nations of whose origin we have authentic records, we find that the state of society consisted of a number of small independent tribes, each of whom was under the command of a chieftain; such was the case of Greece and of Italy, of Gaul and Germany, of Palestine, of England, and of Scotland, and such was the case of the American Indians. Though speculations upon the origin of nations are seldom satisfactory, yet it does not appear difficult to account for such a state of society. We are assured that all mankind are descended from two parents. The paternal authority must have been the first that was exercised. Although each parent would be the governor of his own family, yet the father of a numerous progeny, who again should have families of their own, would, from the number of his children, acquire considerable influence in society. As mankind increased, there would be many of

these heads of families. Any measure which might involve the interest of the whole community would probably be deliberated upon, and decided by these heads of families. The first form of government in any populous nation was probably, therefore, an aristocracy. A numerous and powerful family would have numerous servants, and would also be joined by many other persons who would be proud of the alliance. At last the animosity of rival tribes might cause a civil war. The community might become dismembered, or divided into as many independent states as there were powerful families, or tribes. As mankind increased, too, food would be more difficultly obtained, and it would become advisable that some portion of the community should seek another possession. A man who felt most distress, or who felt a strong inclination for travelling, would take his family with him, and make a settlement in an uninhabited country. Another family would follow his example, and make a settlement in the same country. As their families increased, they would form so many tribes. As long as they continued separate from each other, or in hostility against each other, each tribe would be governed by a single chief; but if they united and formed one nation, it would become a sort of confederacy or aristocracy.

This view of the progress of society in the early ages of the world appears to be countenanced by the earliest records of history.

The Jewish nation was descended from a single father, Jacob. He had twelve sons, and their descendants formed twelve distinct tribes. Though forming one nation, these twelve tribes did not even intermarry with each other. Each tribe was again subdivided into families, and the heads of these families were the chief men, or princes, who governed the affairs of the tribe. These tribes were perfectly independent of each other in the administration of justice between its own members. Nay, each tribe might even declare war against another nation without consulting the other tribes. In this sense must we understand the expression, "In those days there was no king in Israel, every man did that which

was right in his own eyes." Every family, or tribe, acted as they pleased in their political relations. The object which the Jews had in wishing for a king, was not that he might make laws for their government, but that he might march out at their head and fight their battles. In this state of society a chieftain is little more than a military commander. In time of peace the tribes have no occasion for his services. If, indeed, he has been very successful in war, he will acquire a formidable influence in time of peace, and will, perhaps, be able to change the form of the government into an absolute monarchy.

The early history of Greece and of Italy exhibit a similar state of society, though they do not appear to have kept their families so distinct, nor their genealogies so correct as the Jews. The Greeks were originally different colonies, planted at different times by different families who emigrated from Egypt. The aborigines of the country probably associated themselves with the new comers, whose superiority in the arts and sciences gave them a considerable advantage over the natives. The Greeks, as they multiplied, colonized in the same way the coasts of Italy and several provinces of Lesser Asia. Rome was founded by a band of adventurers under the command of Romulus. Those families who had wealth he formed into a senate, and they were styled Patricians; the lower sort were styled Plebeians and had assemblies of their own. The inhabitants of the Highlands of Scotland were, not a century ago, formed into clans or tribes. In former times the chiefs of these clans exercised independent jurisdiction, and were more free from control by the king than even the barons of the Feudal system. But this form of government is not adapted to a large, and powerful, and opulent nation. It leaves too much to be decided by precedent; it causes dissensions and wars between the rival tribes; it is the cause of delay and inconvenience in regard to foreign states; and it prevents a uniformity of laws throughout the respective districts.

The object of all government is threefold. The first is to defend the state against external enemies: this appears to be

the principal end of the government in all countries which have made but a small advance in civilization. When war is determined upon they elect a chief; and when peace is restored, his authority ceases. But when nations become civilized and wealthy, and their intercourse with each other is increased, new relations are formed, and many other circumstances besides that of war require consideration. But as a numerous body cannot act in their collective capacity in their intercourse with other states, it is necessary there should be an individual, or a small number of individuals, who may act in behalf of the whole nation. The nation declares war, or makes peace, and enters into commercial or political relations with another nation, entirely through the medium of its government. A second object of government is to make laws for the regulation of the community. This is one of the most important functions of government, and upon the right exercise of this power depends, in a great measure, the happiness of the state. Although this is one of the duties of a government, yet there have been some small states in which the government has not been intrusted with this power. At Athens the laws were made, not by the government, but by the citizens at large, in their public assemblies. At Rome, after the establishment of the tribunes, the people had a veto, and no law could be made without their consent; and ultimately the people obtained the power of passing laws themselves. The third object of government is to carry into execution the laws that are made,—this is called the executive department; it belongs to the executive power to preserve internal tranquillity—to see that the laws are properly observed—to levy all taxes—to fill up all the offices in the army and navy, and in the civil departments of the public service. The fourth object of government is to administer justice between the members of the community,—this is called the judicial department. The administration of justice is the great end of all government; it is to prevent the strong oppressing the weak: without this there can be no security, tranquillity, or industry. But while the judicial appears to be the most important branch of government, it

seems to have been the last which was called into exercise. In the early history of all nations we read of military chiefs before we read of judges; and society is considerably advanced before we meet with a lawyer or a barrister. We may suppose that the same individual was both a general and judge: such was the case under the feudal system. The barons derived considerable revenues from fees paid by suitors in their courts. It is probable that in the early stages of society the chiefs administered justice to their followers in the same way. It is said of several of the Hebrew generals that they judged Israel; but yet it is not probable that the judges were oppressed with the number of cases brought before them, since we know that the injuries or frauds committed upon individuals were often settled by private composition.

Though I have stated four objects of government, yet, as the foreign affairs of a country are usually placed in the same hands as the executive powers, the departments of government are usually considered but three—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial.

It appears necessary to the liberty and happiness of a state that these powers of government should be exercised by three different branches of the constitution. This in some countries (as in our own) has been the case; but different nations have adopted different modes of distributing these three powers, and these various distributions have given rise to what are termed the different forms of government. The form of government in any country is either simple or compouud. The three simple forms of government are monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy. It is the distributive of the legislative power which gives the title to the government. If the power of making the laws is intrusted to a single individual, that government is called a monarchy; if the laws are made by a few individuals, the government is an aristocracy; and if the people at large make the laws, the government is called a democracy. A government constructed according to either of these two forms is called a simple form of government; if a government combine two or more of these forms, it is called a compound form of government.

I shall, in the first instance, take a view of the simple forms of government, and then consider the compound forms.

The word monarchy is composed of two Greek words, *monos*, one, and *archon*, a chief; it denotes the government of a single person. A pure monarchy is that in which all the three powers—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial—are exercised by a single individual. Such were most of the monarchies of ancient times; such are the present monarchies in Oriental countries; and such is the monarchy in Russia and in Prussia, in Denmark, and in Spain. This form of government is also called a despotism —a despot is different from a tyrant. If an individual have the sole government of a country, he is a despot, for the term despotism refers merely to the form or constitution of the government; but if he use his power cruelly, unjustly, or capriciously, he is then a tyrant. Henry IV. of France, and the late Alexander of Russia, were despots, but not tyrants. The republican government of Rome was often tyrannical, though the constitution was not despotic.

Each simple form of government has its advantages and its disadvantages. In regard to defending a state against the designs of an enemy, monarchy has an immense advantage. There is more unity of council, more secrecy, more activity and despatch under the government of a single individual than in the government consisting of many individuals; indeed, whatever may have been the form of government established in any country, the discipline of its army has always been established upon the principles of despotism. No power could be more absolute than that of a Roman consul in the field of battle. But a general who is merely the servant of a republic in which various councils prevail, according as certain political parties happen to preponderate, may have all his plans frustrated through a want of supplies. Had Hannibal been the monarch of Carthage, he would have conquered Rome; and had not Alexander been a monarch, he might have met the fate of Hannibal.

But, though an absolute monarchy appears the best adapted to defend a country against its enemies, yet it is

not so well adapted to the internal affairs of the nation. If the power of making laws, of executing laws, and of administering justice between individuals, be intrusted to one person, it is obvious that that person is master of the lives and property of every member of the community. A person thus exalted often becomes giddy by his elevation, and is, in all cases, surrounded by courtiers who have an interest in leading him into acts of oppression, and who administer to his pleasures in order to withdraw his attention from his people.

In regard to the making of laws, a single individual, even when aided by his councillors, cannot have the wisdom or the means of information possessed by a larger number of individuals; however wise he may be, he can judge only by the facts with which he is acquainted. To judge, too, of the propriety of altering a law, it is necessary to be a witness of its operation. Hence, it is necessary that the laws should be made by individuals who reside in different parts of the empire, who possess a knowledge of all the local circumstances of each province, and who have themselves witnessed the operation of the laws they propose to modify. It is desirable, too, that the laws should be made by many legislators, because in a public assembly the matter is more likely to be thoroughly discussed, and its bearing upon every branch of the national industry to be thoroughly investigated.

It is also desirable that the laws should be made by persons who are themselves to obey these laws. When a person is to make laws for himself to obey, he will be more cautious and deliberative than when he is making laws for others, but from the operation of which he is himself exempt.

From these considerations it will appear that an unlimited monarchy is a defective form of government in regard to the exercise of the powers of legislation. He cannot possess the requisite knowledge,—he cannot be acquainted with the practical operation of the laws,—and he is not himself subject to the laws he may enact. In addition to these considerations, I may state that a monarch who has the care of the foreign concerns of a large state can have but little time to

attend to its domestic arrangements; and in making laws, he is in danger of acting from caprice, and of making laws for the purpose of accomplishing some favourite object, or of gratifying some private resentment. This was often done by some of the Roman emperors—they made laws requiring respect to be paid to their own images. Darius made a law that whosoever asked any request, of either God or man, for thirty days, should be cast into a den of lions. We meet with numerous instances of absurd laws passed by the Asiatic and Roman monarchs, to gratify either their own caprice or the wishes of their favourites: and we find similar absurd laws have been passed by modern monarchs, particularly by the Emperor Paul of Russia; and occasionally by Joseph emperor of Germany, though many of the laws passed by that great but eccentric emperor are worthy of our admiration. Several absolute monarchs have passed laws for the confiscation of property. Napoleon Bonaparte abolished two-thirds of the national debt of Holland by a single decree. Monarchs think it matters little to which class of their subjects any property belongs; but they forget that by thus rendering all property insecure, they damp the spirit of industry, and prevent all further accumulations of the national capital. This is exemplified in the present state of Turkey.

In the moral sciences, there is no rule without an exception. Although we say it is not proper or beneficial that a single individual should be the sole legislator, yet there are cases in which this is highly desirable and beneficial.

The first case is, when the people are in a state of barbarism, and require that strong and energetic means should be employed to introduce them to a state of civilization.

If in this case the legislators are taken from the people, they will resemble the people, they will have the same attachment to the ancient manners, and will contend for them, in order to obtain the favour of the people. Had Russia a free constitution two centuries ago, they would have remained savages to the present day. It is not true that man is naturally fond of knowledge. Man is no more naturally

fond of knowledge than he is naturally fond of brandy. At first it is disgusting, and it is not until its effects are experienced that it becomes desired. A man in a state of ignorance is never fond of knowledge; he is fond of his ignorance; and he is never willing to acquire knowledge unless he be first convinced that it is a means of getting money. The means which in our own country have been employed to educate the lower orders, did not originate with the lower orders. It was not because they first desired knowledge that the means of knowledge were provided for them. It was the higher and the middle classes who provided the means of knowledge, and who then excited in the minds of the lower classes a desire to avail themselves of these means. If, then, a country be in a state of profound ignorance, it is not proper to select from the body of the people those who are to be the legislators for the people. It is better that a single individual should have the sole legislative power. In fact, we may lay it down as a maxim, that wherever it is desirable to maintain the national manners and institutions in the state in which they are, then is a free constitution the best adapted for that purpose; but wherever it is desirable to alter the manners or institutions of a country, then it is desirable to have a despotic form of government. In confirmation of this, I will allude to a few historical events.

If Constantine had not been a despot, he could not probably have established Christianity as the religion of the Roman state.

If Mahomet had not ruled despotically, he could not so soon have induced the Arab tribes to renounce Paganism and embrace his religion.

If Charlemagne and the other kings of Europe had not been despots, they could not so speedily have procured from the Saxons and their own people a nominal profession of Christianity.

If Henry VIII. had not been virtually a despot, he could not so speedily have established the Reformation from Popery.

If Peter I. had not been a despot, he would not have

made laws to compel the Russians to shave their beards, and cut short their coats, and to adopt the habits of civilized nations.

In all these cases a body of legislators taken from the people would have passed laws in favour of the popular prejudices, and would not have ventured to endanger their re-election by acting in defiance of public opinion, however erroneous that opinion may have been. Even had they not been dependent on popular election, it is probable they would have partaken of the prevalent darkness, and of themselves opposed the introduction of light. In this case, a single legislator is better than numerous legislators. Such appears to have been the case in ancient times, and such were the means by which nations became civilized. Lycurgus, Solon, and Nnma were enlightened individuals, who, having power and authority in their respective nations, were enabled to pass good laws for the regulation of their conduct; but the mass of the people, and even the mass of the great men, were probably in a state of the grossest ignorance.

The second case, in which a single legislator is better than a large number, is, when that large number are taken from a particular class in the community, and the other class or classes are kept in a state of political or domestic slavery.

In this case, if the legislators are taken from one class of the nation, they may pass laws oppressive to the other class. In ancient Rome, when the laws were made by the senate and the people, those laws which affected their slaves were exceedingly severe; but when Augustus became the sole legislator of Rome, those laws were greatly relaxed. In those chartered West India islands which have Houses of Assembly or Parliaments which make laws affecting the slaves, the state of slavery is worse than in those islands which are governed by the king and council, and where the government is of course despotic.* The Emperor Joseph of Germany wished to ameliorate the condition of the slaves in Hungary, but was opposed by the nobility; and had he not been

* Written in 1826.

despotic, he could have done nothing in behalf of the cause of humanity.

These exceptions are not adduced for the purpose of invalidating the general rule. As a general rule, it cannot be disputed that many legislators are better than one.

While, however, it is maintained that a monarch ought not to have the sole power of making the laws, it must be conceded that no laws ought to be made to which the king does not give his consent. If this were the case, the king would be no longer a king; he would be merely the servant of those who had the making of the laws. They might at any time make a law which should circumscribe his prerogatives, or which would abolish monarchy altogether.

If a monarch ought not to have the power of making the laws, it would appear that neither ought he to have the privilege of administering the laws; that is, of exercising the judicial functions. If the king had the liberty of placing what construction he chose upon the laws, and of administering them accordingly, he might as well have the power of making them. But yet it seems improper that this power of administering the laws should be placed in any part of the constitution the interest of which is opposed to that of the king. The English constitution has provided against this difficulty, by electing the judges from among the people. These judges are twelve.* Those dignified personages to whom is given the title of Judge have the power only of advising or directing the jury; and even these judges, though appointed by the king, are appointed for life, so that they cannot be displaced, even though their conduct should be displeasing to the monarch. But in a despotic government, not only does the monarch make the laws, but he also administers them. He appoints the judges, and dismisses them at pleasure.

Not only are the legislative and judicial functions thus in danger of being perverted by a despotic monarch, but even his domestic and his foreign administration are in danger of being abused. An absolute king is prone to military despotism. He keeps a large standing army, and here he

* Since increased in number.

imagines his great strength lies. By this means he can make war abroad, and can crush his subjects at home. To support this army requires great expense; hence taxation must be increased. The national wealth is perverted to the support of empty pomp and parade. The ordinary sources of revenue will not be found sufficient; hence exactions, confiscations, and other unjustifiable modes of raising money, will be resorted to. Industry will be depressed, enterprise discouraged, and poverty will prevail. The conduct of many of the kings of France furnish ample testimony of the justice of the above observations.

In regard to foreign relations, the monarch will often be governed by personal considerations, rather than by a consideration of the national interest. William the Conqueror made war upon the King of France because that monarch had indulged in some pleasantries upon William's illness. Louis XIV. was for many years the terror of his neighbours, though at the same time he impoverished France. All his objects centred in himself; his sole aim was to gratify his personal vanity and ambition.

The great evil of a despotic form of government is, that everything depends upon the character of the prince. The constitution of France was the same under Henry III. as it was under Henry IV.; but how different was the state of France under these different monarchs! Despotic monarchs themselves have been so deeply convinced that the prosperity of their kingdom, and the firmness of their throne, depended upon the personal character of their sovereign, that they have sometimes set aside the next heir to the throne, and have given their kingdom to another son, who possessed brighter talents. Peter I. put his son to death lest he should overthrow the works he had performed. The late Alexander of Russia put aside his brother Constantine. A form of government which thus places the happiness of millions at the disposal of individual caprice is a form of government that is radically bad.

The second simple principle of government is the aristocratic principle. This denotes the government by a few

people, and the word aristocracy is composed of two Greek words,—*Kratos*, government, and *aristos*, best or noblest.

It has a similar meaning to oligarchy, from *arche*, government, and *oligos*, few.

Under the aristocratic principle, the legislative and other functions of government are exercised by a few persons, or by a comparatively small class of persons, who do not derive their authority from the main body of the people. The chief end of the institution of laws is to defend private property. It is to prevent the poor from robbing the rich. But in all ages and nations the rich people are but few when compared with the number of the poor. It is with the mass of the people—that is to say, with the poor—that the physical strength of the country lies. Hence the rich are induced to associate together to protect themselves against the possible encroachments of the poor. The rich administer the laws: the rich maintain order and obedience in the state, conscious that without these their own property would not be secure. As the poor cannot individually withstand the collective energy of the rich, and as the poor, from their distance, and other circumstances, cannot easily combine, the influence of the rich increases. The poor lose all political power, and all the wealth and influence of the state are in the hands of the rich. When this has taken place, the government naturally becomes an aristocracy. The rich make the laws, and the rich enforce the laws. The poor have only to obey.

In regard to legislation, an aristocracy has the advantage over an absolute monarchy; as the members of the aristocracy may justly be supposed to have more wisdom than a single individual; as from their residence in different parts of the empire they possess more local information; and as every measure previous to its adoption will undergo thorough discussion. But as these laws are made by a particular class of the community, they may be oppressive on the other classes. The members of the aristocracy will be anxious to keep down every power that may interfere with their own, in order to exalt their own dignity and importance; and, for this purpose, may pass laws which may be injurious to the

general interest of the nation, and unjust to every other class of the community.

If, too, the members of the aristocracy should be divided into parties, they may plot against one another, and pass laws oppressive towards the members of their own body. If this should be continued for any length of time, it must terminate in a dissolution of the government. Either a civil war would take place, and the general of the conquering party would become king, or the weaker party would call in the assistance of a neighbouring state, and the nation would become a province of another kingdom.

It may be supposed, however, that an aristocracy would have one advantage as a body of legislators. It might be supposed, that as each individual knew, from his infancy, that he was destined to be a legislator, his education would be adapted to qualify him for the exercise of the legislative functions. It is not, however, always the case, that those who are born to the enjoyment of power are instructed in their youth how to exercise it with discretion.

In regard to the judicial functions, it is highly improper that they should be exercised by an aristocracy. In a civil case between one of the privileged and one of the inferior classes, no justice could be expected. In contests, however, between persons of the inferior classes, or between the different members of the privileged class, it would be the interest of the aristocracy to administer justice impartially; and in these cases, justice might be expected, except in those instances in which the case might in any way bear upon the interest of the aristocracy. In criminal cases, the members of the privileged class would probably escape punishment, while the members of the inferior class would be punished with severity.

In regard to foreign relations, it is the interest of the aristocracy to promote the prosperity of the state, as this increases their own power and affluence. The only danger is, that some of the members of the aristocracy may be bribed by some neighbouring power to advocate measures pernicious to the public welfare. In case, too, there is any danger of rebellion on the part of the lower classes, the aristocracy will

sometimes involve the nation in war, in order to draw off public attention to some new objects. But, apart from these circumstances, aristocracies have shown themselves as anxious as any of the other forms of government to secure the wealth and power of the nations over whom they exercised authority.

The third simple principle of government is the democratic principle. The word democracy is derived from two Greek words—*Kracy*, government, and *demos*, people—and denotes a government by the people; a form of government in which the people govern themselves.

This form of government has one advantage over the other two. A monarch, or an aristocracy, may from personal considerations wish to injure the country; but the people can never wish to injure themselves. They are the nation, the national interests are their own: they must therefore have an honest wish to promote the national interests.

But it is necessary that the governors of a country should possess something more than integrity. It is necessary that they should have knowledge, talents, deliberation. That they should be exempt from precipitation, passion, prejudice, and partiality. In these respects a democracy is deficient.

It is almost impossible for a large assembly to deliberate upon any matter. When they meet together they do not come to deliberate, they come to decide. Each individual has previously made up his mind, and is prepared to applaud those speakers whose sentiments are the same as his own, and to hiss down those who maintain opposite sentiments. And even among the more enlightened there will always be some persons who will humour the popular prejudices, and recommend measures pernicious to the public welfare in order to procure popularity among the people.

A public assembly is always governed by passion and feeling. However cautious each individual may be in the management of his private affairs, the individuals collected together catch a sort of social irritation: they have their passions inflamed by contact, and by discussing their real or supposed grievances, their sense of the injury is increased,

and they rush headlong into the adoption of measures the evil consequences of which are not perceived until they are felt.

It often happens that measures which are beneficial to one province of the state are pernicious to another province. In this case, a statesman in a monarchy or an aristocracy considers on which side lies the balance of good, and acts accordingly; so that the state, as a whole, shall receive the greatest advantage. But such a case, under a democracy, would set the different parts of the state in opposition to each other, and would probably occasion a civil war.

In a democracy, the ruling powers are irresponsible. The people are answerable to none for their conduct. They cannot be punished if they do wrong, for the wrong is done to themselves. They are not influenced by a regard for public opinion, for the public opinion is their own opinion. Hence they may perpetrate acts of injustice towards either foreign states or some of their own body—acts which no statesman responsible to another would dare to recommend.

In a democracy, considerable time must elapse before the public sentiments can be collected upon any subject submitted to their deliberation. In many cases of state policy, expedition is necessary. To procrastinate would be to lose the opportunity for action. Sometimes, to decide quickly is of more importance than to decide wisely. But when large bodies of men are to be assembled together, and to discuss questions of vast importance, expedition is not to be expected. Even supposing that in a democracy the decisions were more prudent than those of any other form of government, these decisions would often lose more in time than they would gain in power.

In a democracy, all the subjects discussed must be publicly known to all the neighbouring states: secrecy is impossible. All the weak points of the proposed measure will be brought into notice. All the previous preparations for an expedition must be specified and published. Everything connected with the national resources must be completely exposed. Yet in a thousand cases secrecy is as necessary as expedition. With-

out this the best-concerted measures are often unsuccessful. Who that is going to invade an enemy's country would inform him beforehand when the attack would be made, with what force it would be conducted, and on what quarter the invasion would first be attempted? If it were necessary to adopt precautionary measures against the efforts of an ambitious rival, would it be proper or wise to inform him of our suspicions, and to let him know in what way we were preparing to resist his attempts? Would not this lead at once to an open rupture? Yet such must be the case in a government whose form is a democracy.

I have thus noticed the probable operation of the three simple principles of government. I shall now notice how they have been combined, and notice their effects as recorded on the page of history.

If we take a view of the various forms of government which are presented to us on the page of history, we shall find they may be distributed into two grand classes: those which have no king, and those which have one. Governments of the first class are called republics; those of the second class are called monarchies.

The word republic is derived from two Latin words, *res* and *publica,* and denotes the public interest or welfare. This name was adopted by the founders of some republics to intimate that the chief end of the government was to promote the public good, and not to administer to the gratification of an individual, which was supposed to be the case with some monarchies.

Republics may be divided into three kinds:—

1. Aristocratical republics.
2. Democratical republics.
3. Mixed republics.

An aristocratical republic is that which is founded upon the aristocratical principle. A democratical republic is founded upon the democratical principle. A mixed republic is a republic in which the aristocratical and democratical principles are combined.

Monarchies are also of three kinds:

1. Absolute monarchies.
2. Legislative monarchies.
3. Limited monarchies.

By an absolute monarch I mean a despot. An absolute monarchy is a government in which all the functions—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial—are exercised by one individual. Such, in all ages, have been the governments of Asia; and such, at the present day, is the government of Turkey.

The second kind of monarchy is a legislative monarchy. I have adopted this word legislative for want of a better. By a legislative monarchy I mean such as that of France before the Revolution, or the present governments of Russia, Austria, Prussia, and Denmark. The monarchs of these countries possess absolute power in their legislative capacity; but they do not possess absolute power in other respects, in the same way as it is possessed by the despotic monarchs. Those are masters of the lives and fortunes of their subjects; and they do what they please with each, without even the form of a trial. When the grand seignior wishes to deprive a subject of his life, and to confiscate his property, he merely sends an executioner to perform the errand, and the unhappy culprit implicitly submits to the mandate. But in a legislative monarchy the lives and property of individuals are sacred. No person is put to death until after at least the form of a trial; and many places and persons have privileges with which the monarch does not interfere. The main thing which distinguishes an absolute from a legislative monarchy is, that the latter is connected with an order of nobility, the former has none. There are no noblemen in Turkey: all are equal.

A limited monarchy is that in which the monarch is limited by the forms of the constitution in regard to his legislative as well as in regard to his other functions. Such is the constitution of Great Britain, of France, of the Netherlands, and of Denmark.

I shall begin with the consideration of republics.

First, aristocratical republics.

I do not recollect that anywhere in ancient history we find a republic purely aristocratical, though the early forms of government among all nations appear to approach to an aristocracy. A nation appears to have been originally formed by a collection of petty tribes under different chieftains. In times of war these chieftains would sometimes choose one of their own number to be generalissimo of their armies, and he for the time was their monarch. At other times, each chieftain was the petty monarch of his own tribe. Such was the state of the different colonies who left Egypt and settled in Greece; such was the case with the original inhabitants of Rome; such was the case with the Jewish nation before they had a king; and such, in modern times, was the case with the inhabitants of the Highlands of Scotland. As society advanced, however, and as wealth and commerce increased, these forms of government gave way, and were succeeded either by monarchies or by mixed republics. In fact, it is probable that the democratic principle actually, though not constitutionally, had great influence in these forms of government.

The most splendid instance recorded in History of an aristocratical republic is the Republic of Venice.

Venice, seated at the extremity of the Adriatic, possessed many ships, and the greater part of the commerce of Europe. She imported, through Constantinople and through Egypt, the rich treasures of the East, and distributed them throughout all the European countries. Her manufactures were of the finest kind, and her power superior to many of the neighbouring monarchies. For many ages she was one of the wealthiest of nations; and even when the discovery of the passage round the Cape of Good Hope had cut off the sources of her wealth and her power, she still for several centuries maintained an independent existence among the nations.

That Venice owed much of her greatness to the advantage of her situation cannot be denied; but it must still be maintained that she also owed much to the prudence of her councils and the wisdom of her government.

The government of Venice was purely aristocratical. Every nobleman was a member of the senate, and the senate had the sole government of the state. Every son of a nobleman was a nobleman; hence the noble families of Venice were preserved in all their branches from forming any alliance, or from having any community of interest with the main body of the people. The senate chose the chief magistrate, who was called a doge. When he assembled the senate, he addressed them thus:—"Illustrious senators, masters of the republic and of me."

If we compare the government of Venice, which was an aristocratical republic, with that of Genoa, which was a democratical republic, we shall have a striking illustration of the superiority of the former. In the councils of Venice there was consistency, and regularity, and energy. In those of Genoa everything was governed by popular frenzy. The preponderance of one party over another changed at once all the maxims of government; and the various parties were more anxious to humble one another than to humble the neighbouring states.

Though the affairs of Venice were thus wisely conducted for several ages, yet we cannot suppose that its government was very well adapted for promoting the happiness of the people.

As the government of Venice was entirely in the hands of the nobles, it was a main thing with them to guard against any interference in matters of state on the part of the people. Hence the people were prohibited even from talking on political subjects; and spies were everywhere employed to procure information as to the infringement of this order.

Besides this, the people were encouraged to inform against one another. A public box, called the "lion's mouth," was placed in the street, and any person who chose might throw in here any accusation against a fellow-citizen. As this was done anonymously, any individual might gratify his private vengeance by preferring a false accusation against his neighbour. All these papers were perused by the government, who made what use of them they pleased.

The government, too, systematically and avowedly encouraged debauchery and profligacy of manners among both the nobles and the people, in order to divert their attention from affairs connected with the state. In every age Venice has been a sink of impurity. By thus debilitating the bodies and the minds of the people, the government had strength enough to maintain its authority. To be virtuous was almost an act of treason, and an eminence in vice was the only distinction to which any one might safely aspire.

The nobles were not allowed to become generals in their armies, lest they should employ the soldiers to overturn the government. Hence the army of Venice was always governed by a foreigner; and many of the troops, too, in time of war, were hired of the neighbouring nations. But the nobles were encouraged to become sailors. The government had penetration enough to perceive that the maritime strength of a country cannot be employed as the instrument of overturning or altering its government.

But besides all these precautions, the government of Venice was obliged to call in the aid of the monarchical principle, and that, too, in one of its most odious forms. Five of the senators were appointed to be what were called state inquisitors. It was their office to make inquiries not only as to the conduct of the people and of the senators, but even of the doge himself. All their operations were in secret, and their power was immense. They might imprison or put to death any individual as they pleased, and no one dared to inquire the reason. It is said that this tremendous power was exercised against those nobles who was suspected of holding a secret intercourse with foreign states.

Thus we see, in the history of Venice, the spirit of aristocratical republics. They are remarkable for prudent and consistent councils; for an extreme jealousy of the inferior classes, and of the influence of the neighbouring states; for secrecy in the administration of justice; and for a cautious watchfulness over the members of their own body. The main body of the people are as much depressed as under the most absolute monarchies; and even the members of the

aristocracy are individually in absolute subjection to the whole body.

The second kind of republics are democratical republics.

These are founded upon the democratical principle. Such were the republics of Athens, and of several of the ancient states of Greece. At Athens the main body exercised all the functions of government, the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. This form of government appears to have produced the following effects :—

1. A democratic republic is remarkable for great fickleness and inconsistency in the public councils.

2. A democratic republic is remarkable for an extreme jealousy of the influence of the great and wealthy. Hence arose, as at Athens, that curious law called the ostracism. By this law, if five thousand of the citizens should vote that any individual should be banished the state for ten years, he was to be so banished. This law was enforced only against those great men who were supposed to have influence enough to change the form of government. Thus we find, that while in an aristocratical republic the lower classes are oppressed, in a democratical republic the higher classes are oppressed. For a man to deserve well of his country would be to obtain banishment from that country. The state was thus deprived of the men who best knew how to promote its interests. At the same time this practice was probably well adapted to promote the end it had in view, namely, to secure the democracy against the intrusion of the aristocratical influence. At the same time, too, I must acknowledge that a partial oppression of the lower classes appears to be necessary in order to maintain an aristocratical republic ; but this admission only shows more strongly the imperfections of those constitutions which required the adoption of such means for their support.

3. Democratical republics are often guilty of injustice in their judicial capacity, especially in cases in which wealthy men are concerned.

4. Democratical republics are often torn asunder by the

violence of party spirit. In all free countries there are parties. This is a necessary consequence of the possession of political liberty. It is a consequence that is not to be regretted. It is only when parties carry their animosities to too great a length that they become pernicious. When party spirit, like the sun in the temperate zones, only darts obliquely on the mind, it gives strength and energy to the intellectual powers, matures the fruits of knowledge, and paints with more lovely hues the flowers of genius; but when, like a torrid sun, it darts perpendicularly on the mind, it dries up all the sources of mental greatness: the understanding becomes a barren waste, and every department of the soul becomes a desert, where vegetation is unknown, and where savage monsters prowl. To this excessive degree party spirit appears to have arrived at Athens. It has been observed by Adam Smith that, at Athens, the ascendency of one party was always attended with the massacre of the other.

While we thus point out the evil effects of democratical republics, we ought not to overlook their beneficial influence on the minds of the people. In a democratical republic every man has a share in the management of the state. Every man is conscious of his own importance, and enters into the discussion of every question connected with the public welfare. These exercises necessarily call the mental faculties into play, and give tone and energy to the intellectual powers: and when the human mind has acquired strength and energy in any one of its operations, the effects of that energy are observable in every other operation in which it may engage. Discussion and debate are the gymnastics of the mind; and whatever may be the subject on which they are employed, they are sure to whet and improve the discrimination and the judgment. Hence it is probable that the form of government established in Greece, though politically imperfect, may have been the cause why it produced so many great men. It was in Greece that the greatest philosophers, legislators, and orators have arisen. It was from Greece that the arts and sciences were imported

to Rome. Even when Rome had attained her greatness, she could not vie in intellect and science with the fallen republic of Athens. She sent her sons to Greece to acquire their education; and the language of Greece became the ordinary language of both the gay and the learned.

I have thus noticed the spirit of democratical republics. They exhibit great fickleness in their public councils, great jealousy of the aristocratic principle, injustice in their judicial capacity when the interest of the great are concerned, and a great degree of violence and party spirit; while, at the same time, they seem to stimulate the exertions and invigorate the powers of the mind.

I shall now proceed to the consideration of mixed republics. Mixed republics are those in which the aristocratical and the democratical principles are combined. Such was the republic of Rome, of Carthage, of Sparta, and of some other ancient states.

As these republics include two principles, these principles will, of course, militate against each other. The order of nobility, or the higher class, will unite and form the aristocracy, the common people will form the democracy; and these two parties will be always attempting to encroach on the liberties of each other. The constitution should be so arranged as to permit each party to be successful to a certain extent; but not to permit either party effectually to overpower the other. Each party should possess functions to which the other might not aspire; but yet certain privileges might be left in such a state of uncertainty as to form debatable ground between the two parties.

The most illustrious example of this kind of republic recorded in history is the republic of Rome. And by scrutinizing the principles of this republic, we shall obtain an insight into all other republics similarly constructed.

The people of Rome were divided into two classes, the patricians and the plebeians. These two classes were perfectly distinct. No marriages could legally take place between them. The assembly of the patricians was called

the senate. The plebeians had also assemblies of their own. After the expulsion of the kings, these two classes had the entire management of the state. Rome was a republic. The senate had the power of making war or peace. None but patricians could hold any office in the state: and the senate was the last court of appeal in judicial cases. On the other hand, the senate could make no law without the concurrence of the people.

The contests between these two parties were carried on for several hundreds of years. Most of these contests ended in favour of the people. By degrees they obtained laws permitting the marriages of patricians with plebeians; allowing the last court of appeal in judicial cases to be the assembly of the people; granting plebeians to hold offices in the state; and eventually the people obtained also a portion of the executive power. They declared war; they appointed the generals of the army; and the governors of the provinces. Upon this followed the ruin of the Roman republic. Julius Cæsar, though a patrician by birth, headed the plebeian party. He was the hero of the mob. The people, in gratitude, gave him the government of Gaul; and with the authority he thus acquired, he subverted, amid the acclamations of his party, the government of his country.

In reviewing the contests which took place between the two parties in ancient Rome, we are sometimes surprised that the senate should be so tenacious in retaining certain privileges, and in exercising certain prerogatives over the plebeians; but in a mixed republic, where there are only two principles, it seems necessary that each party should contend strongly for every privilege that seemed to be a distinction of the party. In such a state each party incessantly tries to overthrow the other; liberality is quite out of place, and may be attended with danger; if the parties have no real grievances, they will find imaginary ones. It seemed wise, therefore, in the patricians to keep unredressed as long as possible certain real evils, that they might, in times of popular ferment, be the chief points of attack. Thus

the storm was diverted from the citadel of aristocracy, and spent itself in demolishing a few of the insignificant outworks: step by step these outworks were destroyed, and at last the citadel itself was overthrown.

In all mixed republics it is desirable that the executive powers should be exercised by the aristocracy. The Roman constitution provided for this effectually by excluding all plebeians from holding offices in the state: but in a military state it would necessarily happen that some plebeian soldiers would occasionally so distinguish themselves as to be fairly entitled to hold some of the first offices. Still they could not be elected to office. The hardship of the case was so obvious that attempts were consequently made to render the plebeians capable of bearing the highest offices. Here was a difficulty for which the constitution of Rome did not provide a remedy. If the plebeians were allowed to hold the highest offices in the state, the aristocratical principle would be so much weakened as not to be able to oppose an effectual resistance to the democratical principle, and the constitution would then be overthrown. If, on the other hand, the plebeians were universally excluded, it would necessarily give rise to cases of individual hardship which the whole plebeian party would feel, and resent as a stigma upon their body.

The patrician party might easily have extricated themselves from these difficnlties, by making a law that those members of the plebeian body who should greatly distinguish themselves might be capable of being adopted by the patrician body, and of becoming patricians. Had such a law existed, it would have been an object of ambition to all the leaders of the plebeian party to become patricians; they would never have wished to overthrow the patricians, because by that means they would abolish those distinctions which they themselves hoped to attain; and the patricians might easily rid themselves of any turbulent plebeian by making him a patrician: he would then have an interest in supporting the party by which he had been adopted. Could Marius have become a patrician, the civil war between him and Sylla would probably have been prevented.

The influence of such a principle as that to which I have referred, was sufficiently obvious in another department of the Roman constitution. The powers of the Roman consul were enormous: a Roman consul in that republican state possessed powers far more extensive than those which are possessed by the King of Great Britain. It is difficult to conceive how those powers were compatible with the existence of liberty. Why were not those powers abridged? Why did not the people, in their different retirements to the Sacred Mount, never demand an abridgment of the powers of the consuls? Why did not the tribunes, the leaders of the people, those men who were anxious to point out to the people every circumstance that appeared to endanger their liberty, never allude to this? The reason is plain: the tribunes themselves hoped to become consuls; the heads of the people looked to this as the highest point of their ambition; and hence never wished to abridge privileges which they might themselves enjoy.

The principle to which I have alluded does exist in the constitution of our own country. A member of the House of Commons is capable of becoming a member of the House of Lords. A bill was once passed through the Lords to limit the numbers of peers, but it was thrown out in the Commons. Had this bill become law, it is possible the House of Peers would not now exist; the House of Commons would then be in direct opposition to the House of Peers, and would wish for its overthrow. Now, the leading members of the House of Commons look to the House of Peers as a post to which they hope to arrive; we hear from them no complaints of the privilege of the Peers.

On the other hand, the executive power is, with us, confined to one individual; none of the popular leaders can hope to become even a temporary king; hence, to declaim against the power of the crown cannot be attended with the diminution of individual privilege. With the Romans there was a new king every year; hence, all those who hoped to become kings were anxious to support the prerogatives of the temporary monarch, however pernicious they might be to the interests of the people.

In the absence of this principle, the plebeians had no alternative but to attempt to invade the privileges of the patricians, and to render members of their own body capable of holding office. This they effected: a law was obtained for this purpose; but, although the plebeians contended strongly for this law, it was many years before it was called into operation: it was many years before the plebeians elected one of their own body to fill the office of consul. It is not easy to account for this: it may have arisen from that deference which the common people of all agricultural countries feel towards persons of distinguished rank; or perhaps during that interval the patricians had influence enough to defeat the attempts of the plebeians; or perchance there were no plebeians sufficiently wealthy and distinguished to occupy the office.

In the Roman constitution the legislative power appears to have been properly divided; the concurrence of both parties was essential to the passing of a law. In the latter days of the republic, when it was fast falling to ruin, the people claimed the power of making laws which should be obligatory on the patricians, while, at the same time, if any law was proposed in the senate which the tribune of the people did not approve, he might exclaim, "Veto—I forbid;" and the law could no longer be discussed.

The judicial power, too, appears to be exempt from any accusation. In the various tumults of the people, they never appear to have accused their judges of any partiality, though these judges were chosen from the patricians. Tiberius Gracchus deprived the patricians of this power, and gave it to the knights, a new order that sprung up in Rome, and whose business it was to collect the revenue. This law was exceedingly pernicious; the knights were grossly corrupt; their servants and slaves robbed the people, and no justice could be obtained against them. In regard to political crimes, the people claimed and obtained the privilege of trying them in opposition to the senate. Caridinus and some other members of the patrician order were tried for real or supposed offences before the assemblies of the people, and they were treated

with as much justice as culprits usually are when tried by their political opponents.

The other defects or excellences of the Roman constitution will, perhaps, appear by contrast, when I come to speak of monarchy.

While speaking of republics, it would be deemed unpardonable if I were to leave unnoticed the most splendid republic which now exists on the surface of the globe: I mean the Republic of the United States of North America.

It would be, perhaps, difficult to decide whether this republic ought to be styled a democratical republic or a mixed republic. It differs from the ordinary democratical republics inasmuch as it has two Legislative Assemblies—a Senate and a Congress—and it differs from the Roman and other mixed republics inasmuch as both these Legislative Assemblies, the Senate as well as the Congress, are, directly or indirectly, elected by the people.

The democratic principle, too, is exercised in a way different from that in which it was exercised by the republics of antiquity. In the ancient states, the people acted for themselves. Among modern nations, they appoint representatives. To a modern reader, it appears surprising that, in the history of all the governments of antiquity, he never meets with the principle of representation. The laws and other measures proposed for discussion were laid before the people *en masse.* And, although it must have been obvious that the greater part of the populace were not qualified to judge, and, previous to the art of printing, the necessary information could not be circulated among the people, yet they never had recourse to the principle of representation.

From this circumstance it has been supposed that the ancients were unacquainted with this principle; but it is difficult to conceive how so obvious a principle could remain unknown. Whenever ambassadors were appointed to treat with other nations, the principle of representation was recognized and acted upon. The truth probably is, that most of

the republics of ancient times were small states, and the people could assemble together more easily than in a large nation. Rome certainly became a large state, but still, as all the national affairs were settled by the citizens who resided at Rome, the people found not much difficulty in assembling together. This was a great defect in the Roman government. Had all the cities of Italy been allowed to send representatives to Rome, to act in conjunction with other representatives chosen by the city of Rome, the gross corruption and tumults which prevailed in the latter years of the republic might have been prevented. When, however, the people are in possession of actual power, they will never give that power to a representative. In all free countries every man thinks himself well qualified to judge of all matters connected with the government of the country. It has been said, there are three things which every man imagines he understands, whether he has studied them or not,—politics, medicine, and the art of mending a dull fire.

In the republic of America, as in the republic of Rome, the executive power is elective, and is held only for a short time. The Roman consuls were chosen for one year; the American president is chosen for four years, and at the end of that term he is eligible for election for four years more. In the situation in which Rome was placed, this regulation tended to increase her greatness, as each consul was anxious to distinguish himself by some splendid feat. A successful war procured a military triumph and great renown. But in the present state of the world, and in such a state as America now is, when the arts of peace tend more to national greatness than the arts of war, this regulation of the executive functions may not produce so happy an effect. One great evil of it is, that every president is regarded as the head, not of the nation, but of a party in the nation. He fills the office because his party has overthrown the opposite party. He is naturally inclined, both by gratitude and interest, to exercise his authority so as to maintain the ascendency of that party to whom he is indebted for his honours. The defeated party, too, must regard him as the champion of their opponents,

and will treat his commands, not with the submission due to a ruler, but with the hostility excited by a successful rival. This is a source of weakness in a state, and in a time of war may produce disastrous effects.

The growing prosperity of America has awakened in the minds of politicians the following inquiries:—Is it likely that America will ever become formidable to Europe? and, if her prosperity should continue, is it likely she will retain the present republican form of government? I shall examine these questions, principally because it will give me an opportunity of laying before you several important principles of political science.

To render America formidable to Europe, her wealth and power must be increased. That the wealth and power of the United States of America will at no very distant time be greatly multiplied I think we may safely venture to predict; but that this accession of power should be formidable to Europe, it is necessary that all the different states should remain in their present state of union. This is highly improbable. The territory of the United States is so extensive, that, when fully peopled, it could not well be governed by one government, at least not so well as though each state had a separate government. Besides, in so extensive a territory, having different soils and climates, and different natural advantages, many cases may occur in which that line of policy which is beneficial to one state may be pernicious to another. Those states which depend chiefly upon commerce would require a different policy from those states which were agricultural. These observations do not depend entirely upon theory. In the last war with Great Britain, some of the American provinces were declared by the President to be in a state of rebellion, because they continued to trade with the British colonies; and some of the northern states spoke of separating themselves from the Union. Besides this, the two parties which prevail in America have their main strength in different states; the northern states are the stronghold of federalism, while the southern states form the chief seat of democracy.

I may observe, too, that the new states* recently founded in America should they attain to any formidable strength, will be so many checks to the power of the United States. They will become the natural allies of those European states which may be peculiarly exposed to the hostility of the United States.

The second question is, whether, after America has become wealthy and populous, she will maintain her present form of government?

I lay no claim to the gift of prophecy. We can judge of the future only by the past. We are warranted to suppose that similar causes will produce similar effects in time to come, as they have produced in times which are gone by. If this were not the case, of what use would be the study of history? The only mode we have of judging of the continuance of the American republic is to investigate those principles which have produced the downfal of other republics. From an examination of these principles I am induced to believe that, when America shall be fully peopled, it will cease to be a republic.

The principal causes of the downfal of republics have been the following:—

1. Increased extent of territory.

A republic is adapted only for a small state. All the states of Greece were small. Rome at first was only a small state; and when it became large, the republic was overturned. It may be said that America differs from Rome in being a federal republic; that is, a union of several independent states, each having a separate republican government. But there have been other federal republics. Greece was a federal republic for some time. Switzerland and the Netherlands were federal republics. In the two former instances, Greece and Switzerland, there was perpetual contest between the individual states or cantons, and in the latter case republicanism ended in monarchy. The monarch was called a

* This refers to the new republics in South America, the independence of which had then (1826) been recently acknowledged by Great Britain.

stadtholder; he has now the name as well as the authority of a king.

2. Increase of wealth has overthrown republics. In all rich countries the prevailing passion is the love of money. By this patriotism is supplanted. The votes of the poor are sold to the rich. The spirit of republicanism is virtue—that is, a love of the republic; and when this is supplanted by a stronger passion, the form of government is in great danger of being changed. It was by the successful war against the Persians that the Athenians became wealthy, and Pericles the virtual sovereign of Greece. It was soon after the conquest of Asia that Rome became voluptuous, and the republic was destroyed.

3. Republics have been overthrown by the ascendency of the democratic party. When the aristocratical party have the pre-eminence, they seldom choose a monarch; though they may unite against the people, yet they would also unite against any one of their own body who should attempt to become their king. But when the democratic party are successful, the chief of that party becomes a monarch. When the plebeian party gained the ascendency at Rome, Julius Cæsar, the head of the party, became emperor. When the people were successful against Charles I; Oliver Cromwell became lord protector. And in the French Revolution, the success of the people exalted Napoleon Bonaparte into an emperor. Though these cases differed in many of their circumstances, yet they all seem to justify the principle I have laid down; and this principle will perhaps receive further confirmation from the conduct of the people of some of the states of Europe, who, when under a limited monarchy, have rendered their monarch absolute, in order to humble the aristocracy. In America the democratic principle is unquestionably too strong. Should the democratic party overcome the federalists, there is danger that their chief, if he be a clever man, and circumstances should favour his views, may become their monarch.

I have now finished the consideration of republics. I have

classed them into three kinds: a democratical republic, such as Athens; an aristocratical republic, such as Venice; and a mixed republic, such as Rome, I shall now pass on to the consideration of monarchies. These, too, as I have stated, are of three kinds: an absolute monarchy, such as Turkey; a legislative monarchy, such as Russia; and a limited monarchy, such as that of Great Britain.

1. Absolute monarchy.—In this kind of government, as I have already stated, the legislative, the judicial, and the executive functions are centred in one individual. The monarch is the absolute master of the lives and fortunes of all his subjects. The effect of such a form of government upon the people may be seen in the present state of Turkey.

But, pernicious as this form of government may be, it has been the favourite form of government among all the Asiatic nations. The emperor of China is despotic; all the princes of India were despotic; the kings of Babylon, of Egypt, of Macedon, and Judæa were all despotic. Numerous revolutions have taken place in India and in Turkey, and the reigning monarch has been put to death; but the form of government has never been changed. The new monarch has always been invested with all the powers of his predecessors. The idea of monarchy is so interwoven with the idea of government in the minds of the Asiatics, that the Dutch ambassadors could not make one of the Eastern monarchs comprehend how a state could possibly exist without a king.

One great evil of this kind of government is that the monarch possesses the judicial power. Hence he puts culprits to death at once, without even the form of trial. We find several instances of this recorded in the Sacred Volume. Both David and Solomon executed criminals at once, merely by saying: "Go, fall on him;" and the generalissimo of the army was usually the executioner. The principal officers of the grand seignior are often despatched in an equally summary way.

No form of government is so well adapted as this to display the personal character of the monarch. Hence, under a wise and great sovereign, nations, under this form of

government, have risen into distinction, and more especially military nations, for whom an absolute monarchy appears better adapted. But when the case is reversed, the condition of the nation is deplorable; the happiness of millions depends on the character of one man; and that man, from the temptations to which he is exposed, is not likely to be the best or the wisest of men.

It has been contended that, though an absolute monarch has no constitutional checks to his authority, yet there are virtual and actual checks, and these checks are the church and the army.

In almost every nation, whether ancient or modern, the teachers of religion have been supported by the government, who have taxed the people for this purpose. These teachers of religion, viewed as a body, are usually denominated the church. The utility of such an ecclesiastical establishment has been the subject of much discussion. But this is not a subject that I intend now to investigate. The question now proposed is, whether an ecclesiastical establishment, in a despotic state, is any check to the power of the monarch. The political influence of public bodies is usually in proportion to their wealth. If then the church be very wealthy, it may resist or control the command of the sovereign. But if we are guided by the testimony of history, we shall not find that ecclesiastical institutions have ever opposed the commands of tyranny, except when the tyrant has wished to invade the property of the church. In such cases, the civil and ecclesiastical powers have sometimes been at variance; but though they might occasionally, like the bulls in the fable, contend against each other, yet, whichever succeeded, the people, like the frogs, are sure to be trodden under foot.

Absolute monarchs themselves, so far from considering the church as a rival, have always employed the church as an engine to support their authority, while the church has manifested equal willingness to be the tool of power, provided only that her own possessions should be maintained or increased. We find that in despotic countries the church, so far from assisting the people to throw off their chains, has

always lent her aid to rivet them still firmer and stronger. The monarch has now not only to fleece his people enough to gratify his own rapacity, but he must fleece them still closer, to gratify the cravings of an avaricious priesthood.

The second check to an absolute monarch is supposed to be the army. We may say of this, as of the church: it is a check to the monarch when he attempts to interfere with them; but it is no check when he wishes merely to tyrannize over the rest of the people. Then the army, like the church, is willing to lend its assistance, provided it has a share of the plunder.

2. The second kind of monarchy is a legislative monarchy. A legislative monarchy differs from an absolute monarchy in the following particulars:—First, there is security of person and of property. No individual can be deprived of life, liberty, or property, but by a due process of law in a judicial court; secondly, in a legislative monarchy there is an order of nobility, who succeed to the estates of their ancestors in due succession, independently of the will of the monarch; thirdly, under a legislative monarchy, many cities and towns have ancient charters and privileges with which the monarch cannot interfere. None of these things are found in an absolute monarchy.

On the other hand, a legislative monarchy differs from a limited monarchy: first, a legislative monarchy has the sole power of making laws; secondly, a legislative monarch can raise what taxes he may please, and is not responsible, either by himself or his ministers, for the application of the money; thirdly, a legislative monarch has the appointment of the judges, who decide on all criminal and civil suits. In a limited monarchy, the jury, who are properly the judges, are taken from the people.

In reading ancient history, it is sometimes difficult to ascertain whether those nations which were governed by kings had absolute or legislative monarchies. The Greek writers, who could not see any difference between a king and a tyrant, could not discriminate between the various kinds of monarchies. The ancient kings of Egypt and of Babylon appear to have been absolute. But the Persian monarchy

appears to have been legislative: we often read of the Persian nobility. The history of Daniel will perhaps give us a clear insight into the nature of the Persian monarchy. The king had the sole power of making the laws. At the suggestion of his courtiers, he made a law that no man should make any request, of either God or man, for thirty days, except of the king himself. The passing of such a law as this—a law which interfered with all the exercises of religion, and with all the endearments of social life—proves that the king possessed the sole legislative function. But when the king had passed a law he could not rescind it: the laws of the Medes and the Persians alter not. We find an instance of this, not only in the case of Daniel, but also in the case of Esther. Artaxerxes had made a law that all the Jews should be put to death. He afterwards repented of this law, but he could not alter it. This act of Artaxerxes appears to be rather an act of the executive than of the legislative function, and seems to approach to despotism; yet the inability of the monarch to rescind the order shows that there was some counteracting principle in that form of government. Moreover, when the king had made a law, he could not interfere with its administration. Daniel had violated the law; the king wished to deliver him from punishment, but he could not. To acquit a criminal is an exercise, not of the legislative, but of the judicial function. It would appear that the king had not even the power of pardoning a criminal, although his consent was necessary to carry the law into operation; he had to sign the death-warrant. He did so, and Daniel was sentenced to punishment. All the circumstances appear to show that their was some restriction on the power of the Persian monarchs; there was some principle they dared not overturn; some party they dared not provoke. Yet, we are told, on the following morning the king sentenced all Daniel's accusers to the same punishment as that to which Daniel was sentenced. This was manifestly unjust; they had done no more than enforce a law which he himself had made. From this circumstance it would appear that the king was despotic. How is it that, the day before, he could

not resist the solicitations of these men, and yet on the morrow he could destroy them? We want a more minute detail of the ancient forms of government to enable us to remove these difficulties.

And here I may observe, that in a legislative monarchy, as well as in other forms of government, the king will for ever be attempting to enlarge his prerogatives; and hence we shall often find in legislative monarchies certain royal privileges which appear to belong only to absolute monarchies, the difficulty, therefore, of ascertaining whether some of the ancient monarchies were absolute, or simply legislative, arising. The ancient monarchy of France was only legislative, yet there existed the royal prerogative of issuing *lettres de cachet*, a prerogative which should alone belong to an absolute sovereign; and in many other cases we might point to individual acts that border upon despotism. Nevertheless, we may lay down as general principles, subject only to those individual exceptions to which in the moral sciences all general principles are liable, that a legislative monarchy differs from one which is absolute inasmuch as it is associated with an hereditary nobility; the judicial functions are not exercised personally by the monarch, and there are numerous cities and towns possessing privileges which the monarch cannot invade.

The government of Rome under the emperors was, at first, somewhat similar, in point of effect, to a legislative monarch. The emperor made laws, levied taxes, had the command of the armies, and the prerogative of making war, coining money, and transmitting his crown to his offspring. The senate do not appear to have possessed more power than the present senate of Russia, or the senate of France under Napoleon Bonaparte; still they were a respectable body in the state, possessing hereditary honours and possessions, and whose solicitations were not, at first, slightly treated by the emperors. But that constitution gradually declined from bad to worse. Augustus thought it prudent to make the senate the engine of his government; his successors depended mainly on the army; the principal men among the senate fell victims to

the tyranny of Nero, Domitian, and Caligula, and eventually the government of Rome became an absolute monarchy.

The legislative monarchies of modern Europe took their rise upon the destruction of the feudal system. That system was, in fact, a species of legislative monarchy. But the aristocratic principle was too strong, and the barons, in many cases, exercised the functions of monarchy: they coined money; they administered justice in their own domains; they imposed taxes on goods carried over their lands, and granted markets and privileges of holding fairs; while, at the same time, the king could not command their military service for a longer period than forty days. An alteration in the manners of society, the growth of commerce, and the introduction of standing armies into the pay of the monarch, effected the destruction of the feudal system. The authority of the powerful barons was gradually undermined, and the monarchical power rose into importance. In most countries the main body of the people united with the monarch against the nobles. The history of every age has proved that the mass of the population prefer a monarch to an aristocracy. The king thus extended the powers he previously possessed, and diminished the privileges of the barons: the administration of justice, the coining of money, the imposition of taxes, were privileges vested solely in the monarch; and the estates of the nobles paid in money the supplies previously granted in troops. The nobles retained their estates, and some of their privileges; but they existed no longer as a political body whose functions tended to check the power of the crown: hence the government of most of the nations of Europe became a legislative monarchy. Our own country is an exception; for, as the monarch obtained the victory over the nobles by the assistance of the people, the people rose into importance, and, forming a separate house from that of the barons, the representatives of the people gradually acquired those prerogatives which are now exercised by the House of Commons. It was not, however, until after repeated struggles that the privileges of the popular part of our constitution were so distinctly defined as at the present day. It is highly

probable that, had it not been for the reformation from Popery, the constitution of this country would have become a legislative monarchy. After the overthrow of the barons, there was no check to the power of the crown; hence Henry VIII. was the most absolute sovereign that ever reigned in England. That reign was distinguished by the Reformation. The reformers contended strongly for the right of every man to read the Scriptures, and judge for himself in matters of religion: the people, instructed to contend for the rights of conscience, soon learned to contend for other rights. An abhorrence of ecclesiastical tyranny led to an abhorrence of political tyranny; hence the Reformation erected in the minds of the English people a bulwark against the encroachments of arbitrary power. And while the government of all those nations who had not embraced the Reformation passed from the feudal system to a legislative monarchy, the government of England became, after a struggle or two, a limited monarchy.

The principal legislative monarchies of Europe at the present day are Austria, Russia, Prussia, and Denmark. I have not now time to detail those historical events by which this form of government has become established in these countries. I will point out some of the features by which this form of government is distinguished.

1. Under this form of government, too, much depends on the personal character of the sovereign.

In this respect it resembles an absolute monarchy. The constitution of the French government was the same under Henry IV. that it was under Henry III.; but how different was the condition of France! The constitution of the Austrian government has remained the same for ages; but how different the conduct of its sovereigns! What evils did not Europe apprehend from the madness of the Emperor Paul; yet the constitution of Russia was the same as under the reign of Catherine. Nothing so soon intoxicates the mind as the possession of too much power. The tricks of courtiers are nowhere carried to so great an excess as when the sovereign is not responsible, either by himself or by his ministers, to the

representatives of the people. In such states, how often have the monarchs been governed by their mistresses, and affairs of state been concocted in the bed-chamber! We shall find abundant instances of this if we peruse attentively the history of France.

2. In a legislative monarchy the nobles often have privileges unjust and oppressive towards the main body of the people.

In France, the nobles were exempt from taxation; in Russia, the nobles are the principal proprietors of the slaves who are attached to the soil, and bought and sold like cattle; in Hungary, the nobles raised a rebellion against the Emperor Joseph, because he wished to ameliorate the condition of the slave population. These odious privileges had their origin in the feudal system; and when the monarch obtained the victory over the barons, he was more anxious to deprive them of those privileges which interfered with the exercise of his own power than of those which were oppressive to the other classes of the community.

3. In a legislative monarchy, though there is a virtual, there is no constitutional, check to the conduct of the sovereign.

The privileges of the nobility and the charters of the towns are deemed sacred; the king dares not attack them openly, but he may seek pretences to attack individuals. Should he even attack the whole, there is no constitutional check to the exercise of his power: the only way of resistance is by force.

4. In a legislative monarchy expedients are often found of interfering with the ordinary exercise of the judicial functions.

Thus, in France, when the court had resolved on the destruction of any nobleman, they brought against him an accusation of treason; and did not permit him to be tried by the ordinary tribunals of the country, but appointed a special commission composed of persons who were sure to fulfil the desires of the monarch. Cardinal Richelieu knew well how to employ this instrument. The secret military tribunals erected during the French Revolution were of a similar kind.

5. In a legislative monarchy the people have no authority, and their interests are disregarded.

Hence the mercantile and manufacturing classes are often despised. Notions of honour, notions productive of idleness, pride and poverty, are prevalent. The military order is exalted in public estimation, and war, however destructive to industry, if attended with success, is deemed glorious. The main body of the people thus depressed have often the character and the disposition of slaves,—idleness, servility, and mental imbecility. A legislative monarchy, when capriciously exercised, is often as pernicious as an absolute monarchy in destroying the mental energy of its subjects, and in preventing the growth of that spirit of thinking, of inventing, and of exertion which characterises the inhabitants of all free states.

Having considered the spirit and principles of an absolute and of a legislative monarchy, we shall now proceed to a consideration of a limited monarchy.

An absolute monarchy is founded entirely on the monarchical principle. In a legislative monarchy, the monarchical principle is associated in some degree with the aristocratical principle. A limited monarchy combines the monarchical, the aristocratical, and the democratical principle.

The only instance which is recorded in ancient history of a limited monarchy of this kind is that of the constitution of Rome, as fixed by Romulus.

The most splendid instance of a limited monarchy in modern times is the constitution of the government of our own country. In detailing the principles of this form of government, we shall be guided mainly by a review of the history of Great Britain.

1. In a limited monarchy, the king, as in other monarchies, possesses the executive functions. He can declare war and make peace; he alone can coin money; he is the fountain of honour, and has the sole privilege of conferring titles; he has the sole command of the army and navy, and the appointment of all military and civil officers.

2. In a limited monarchy the legislative functions are possessed jointly by the three bodies representing the monarchical, the aristocratical, and the democratical principles. The consent of each of these bodies is essential to the making of a new law, or the repealing of an old one.

Of the three bodies which possess jointly the legislative function, the first is hereditary, and consists of only one person, namely, the king. The second body is also hereditary, and consists of many persons. All these persons derived their privileges as legislators, in the first instance, from the monarch; but when this privilege is once conferred, it cannot be revoked. The members of the third or democratic body are not hereditary; they are elected for a limited time by the people.

3. The judicial power is exercised by a number of persons taken from the main body of the people. The persons summoned are twelve, and are styled a jury. These persons are taken by lot or rotation from the mass of society; they are not responsible for their verdict, even though it should be in direct opposition to the evidence. The persons called over to serve on a jury, to try any cause, may be objected to by the party about to be tried, if he supposes they entertain any feelings prejudicial to his interest. A judge is appointed by the crown; but he can only direct the jury, and state the law. But the jury are not obliged to follow his counsel, or to adopt his legal interpretation of the statutes.

4. Besides being one of the three houses of legislation, the House of Commons has the sole power of granting supplies and of voting money for the public service. This is one of the most important checks to the executive power. The king may declare war, but he cannot carry on war unless the House of Commons grant him money. The king may wish to increase the standing army, to multiply places or pensions, to indulge in expense, or reward favourites; but how can he do these without pecuniary supplies?

Beside this, the House of Commons can impeach any minister who may have advised the monarch to adopt any measure pernicious to the state. The trial takes place before the House of Lords.

This is a general outline of the constitution of a limited monarchy, and it suggests the following observations. 1. As there are three houses of legislation, an attempt to obtain exorbitant power of any one would be opposed by both the other two; hence the balance is more likely to be maintained. 2. The executive chief is hereditary. 3. The members of the House of Peers cannot be deprived of their titles or privileges. 4. Members of the House of Commons may become members of the House of Peers. 5. No person can be elected a member of the House of Commons unless he have 300*l.* per annum landed property. All who have not property to this amount are excluded by law from becoming members of parliament. 6. "The king can do no wrong;" that is, the king cannot be tried or punished for any of his acts; his ministers only are responsible.

APPENDIX*

TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF POLITICAL HISTORY.

GOVERNMENT AND LAWS OF THE JEWS.

The most splendid instance we have of a number of tribes joining and forming one nation is that of the Israelites. The twelve sons of Jacob became heads of distinct tribes. Each tribe was a small republic in itself, the chief or head man of the tribe being the leader or governor of the tribe, their general in time of war, and their judge in time of peace. He was assisted in his labours by the heads of families, who were styled elders. On extraordinary occasions these heads of families and the chief men of the tribes formed an assembly, or sort of parliament; not, indeed, delegated or chosen by the people, but as heads of families, to whom the heads of smaller families—their children and servants—would pay obedience. Though these men are styled elders, probably they obtained this name from being the acknowledged head or heir of the family rather than from their age; just as the words senator and alderman mean an elderman, or old man, although these offices may be, and often are, held by persons of a youthful age.

The laws by which their decisions were governed were the usages established by custom, or what we call common law. These usages were derived chiefly from the Nomadic or shepherd state of society, as the Israelites, previous to going down into Egypt, were shepherds. To these unwritten laws were afterwards added the laws of Moses, which may be called the statute law.. These laws of Moses, like our statute laws, were intended to supply the deficiencies of the common law. They were not intended to be in themselves a complete code of civil and criminal jurisprudence; much less were they intended to prescribe any given form of political government.

It may be observed, too, that in such a state of society as was the Israelitish, there was no occasion for that multiplicity of laws which have been found useful in modern times. Every man was a farmer; they had no external commerce, and but little internal traffic. Every

* This essay was not intended as an Appendix to the Lecture, but was written several years before, as part of a series of Essays I had commenced on the Political Influence of the Laws of Moses.

man, too, was a landowner, and could not alienate his land except for a given term. Hence laws which have a reference to commerce, to trade, to manufactures, to the customs, excise, and other branches of the public revenue, had no existence. Every man produced, on his own farm or by the labour of his household, almost everything he wanted. They paid no rent, their taxes were paid in kind, and their disputes were matters that could easily be adjusted. In such a state of society there were no complicated cases of law or equity. It was not found necessary that men should receive a legal education in order to be enabled to administer justice. The elders or heads of families in each city were fully competent for this duty. Early in the morning they took their station at the gate of the city, and those who had any dispute stopped as they were going out to their fields, and had their litigations settled at once upon the spot. The criminal cases were despatched in an equally summary way. They had no public executioner; the punishment of death was inflicted by stoning, and the principal witness threw the first stone.

Though all the tribes formed one nation, and were governed by an assembly of elders, yet these elders seemed to have assembled only on extraordinary occasions; and, ordinarily, the different tribes, and even branches of tribes, acted very independently of each other. After having defeated the armies of the Canaanites, and divided their land among the tribes, each tribe had to conquer the enemies in its own territory; and as the whole force of the nation was not brought to bear upon a single position, the original inhabitants were not subdued in some tribes even till the time of David. From the time of Joshua to that of David, the whole nation was seldom united in any one enterprise. The Sichemites, a part only of a tribe, elected a king, and a civil war ensued among themselves, without the other tribes interfering. A part of the tribe of Dan engaged in war, and made conquests, without consulting the other tribes. Jephtha led the Gibeonites against the king of the Amorites without consulting any other part of the nation; and we find that even in the time of Saul the men of Jabesh Gilead were at war with the Ammonites, and Saul did not send them any assistance until they sent him a petition, when on the point of being conquered. Not only did the tribes frequently not unite with other nations, but they were sometimes at war with each other. The Gibeonites and the Ephraimites engaged in war; and to show the cruelty with which the war was carried on, it is sufficient to refer to the circumstance that all those who could not pronounce the word Shibboleth were put to death in cold blood. The Benjamites, too, were nearly wholly destroyed by the other tribes, in consequence of an outrage upon the wife of a traveller who had lodged a night in one of their cities.

Whenever any nation has thus been formed of a number of independent tribes or states, considerable jealousy has always arisen, and

often two of the most powerful states have each been ambitious of taking the lead in the government of the whole. Such was the case in Ancient Greece, when Athens and Sparta contended against each other for the government of Greece. Such, too, was the case with the cantons of Switzerland and the provinces of Holland. And such, in the case before us, was the fact in the history of the Israelites. The children of Judah and of Joseph were more numerous than those of the other sons of Jacob. The children of Joseph were divided into two tribes, those of Ephraim and Manasseh, of whom that of Ephraim was by far the most numerous. As Benjamin was the son of the same mother as Joseph, the tribe of Benjamin became attached to the tribe of Ephraim, and of course hostile to the tribe of Judah. After the death of Joshua, the tribe of Judah was appointed to "go up first;" that is, to take the lead in war. But yet the tabernacle and the ark, the symbol of their religion, remained in Shiloh, which was in the tribe of Ephraim. The first king of Israel was of the tribe of Benjamin. On his death, the tribe of Judah refused obedience to his son, and set up one of their own tribe for their king; and after seven years' civil war, and the assassination of his rival, David became king of all Israel. To remove the hostile feeling which existed between the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, he removed his residence from Hebron, the capital of the tribe of Judah, and made Jerusalem the capital city of the whole nation. Jerusalem was situated within the tribe of Judah, but on the borders of the territory of Benjamin. This policy united the interest of these two tribes so firmly that they never afterwards separated.

The different tribes were held together by the sameness of their religion and the uniformity of their institutions. As long as they strictly observed the laws of Moses, they could not associate with the surrounding nations. From the necessity of keeping separate from other people, they were more united among themselves. They were held together, too, by the peculiar arrangement of the tribe of Levi, which tribe did not, like the other tribes, inherit a united portion of land, but were divided among all the other twelve tribes. Their cities were situated in the midst of the other tribes. They had not private property. The family of Aaron, a considerable branch of this tribe, were employed to officiate as priests in the temple. The remaining families of the tribe were employed either as ministers of religion or as devotees to the liberal arts. They were judges, lawyers, physicians, keepers of the public registers, scribes – in short, they formed that class of society which lived without manual labour. One-tenth of the produce of the land was devoted to their maintenance, besides which they had some separate cities, a portion of all the sacrifices, and other perquisites. In a state of society where printing was unknown, where the mass of the people could neither read nor write, where every man was obliged to till his own fields or attend to

his own flocks, it must have been of great advantage to have so large a portion of the nation devoted exclusively to the cultivation of the arts and sciences, and by their position placed in contact with all the tribes of Israel. A political effect followed. The families of the tribe of Levi were bound together not only by their connection, as belonging to the same tribe, but also by the similarity of their profession: hence they would be averse to the separation of any of the tribes; and as their literary and religious character gave them great influence, they exercised it in keeping the different tribes in good feeling towards each other. Jeroboam was so convinced of this, that when he separated the ten tribes from the family of David, he deprived the tribe of Levi of the exclusive right to officiate as ministers of religion, and he made of the lowest of the people ministers of the sanctuary and priests of the high places.

The separation of the ten tribes was produced by Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, of the tribe of Ephraim, the tribe which had always been hostile to the tribe of Judah, and next to Judah the most powerful. Solomon had levied excessive taxes upon all the tribes of Israel. It does not appear that the people questioned his right to do so, but they complained of the amount. The kings of Israel and Judah exercised a power approaching to despotism. In their legislative functions they were in some degree restrained by the fixed habits of the people, or the common law, and by the written law of Moses. In their judicial functions they seem to have been very arbitrary, acquitting or condemning as they pleased. In their executive powers they made war or peace as they chose; they appointed the officers of state, and even sometimes ventured to depose the high-priests. In the subsequent periods of the history both of Judah and Israel, we find the religion of the country was often changed at the pleasure of the monarch.

I will now present you with a few observations on the laws of Moses. These laws are worthy of our consideration, whether we view the peculiar circumstances which attended their promulgation, the observance they have received for a succession of ages, or their intimate connection with the history of our most holy religion. In treating this subject, I shall refer principally to those statutes which were peculiar to the Jewish code. Like the laws of some other legislators, murder and adultery were punished with death; theft was punished by restoring fourfold. Property was equally divided among the sons and daughters of the deceased. Polygamy and divorce were permitted.

One peculiarity of the Mosaical code of laws was the appointment of cities of refuge for the person who had accidentally killed another. In case the culprit was found by the next relative of the person slain, he was liable to be put to death. But after the death of the high-priest he was allowed to return to his own city, and was exempt from any further penalty. But why, you inquire, this severity against a person who had

incurred no moral guilt—who had never conceived any criminal intention—whose act was purely accidental? Is this reconcilable with the principles of justice? To judge of a law, it is necessary to understand the character of the people for whom the law is intended. Solon and his laws were as good as the people could bear. Moses said he had given the children of Israel statutes which were not good. From this impression we may learn that laws which were not absolutely perfect may be better adapted than any others to promote the objects of legislation among that people to whom those laws are prescribed. Of this character is the law respecting the cities of refuge. The Israelites were a barbarous* and cruel people, soured by adversity, and addicted to revenge. It was considered incumbent on every individual to revenge the death of a relative; and sometimes even a personal insult involved whole families in a perpetual contention. This spirit is common to all barbarous nations. It was strikingly exemplified in the contest between the Gileadites and the Ephraimites. Moses could not expect a single exertion of authority to extinguish this implacable disposition. Hence he endeavoured to direct and control its operation. The first limitation was in regard to the persons. None but the actual perpetrator was responsible for the offence, and none but the next of kin was allowed to pursue the criminal. By this means the animosity became personal instead of extending to the families. The next limitation regarded the place. No offender could be punished within the cities of refuge. These six cities were selected from those of the priests, that the security of the place might be increased by giving it the sanction of religion. The last limitation had a reference to time. After the death of the high-priest the criminal might return to his home, and was exempt from any further molestation. As the high-priest was generally advanced in years before he attained his office the period of banishment could never be very long. The uncertainty of the event tended to diminish the feelings of revenge. The importance of the event and the sacred character of the deceased would naturally occupy the public mind, and diminish those feelings of resentment which might be excited at the sight of the criminal, and even throw around his person the safeguard of religion.

* The word *Barbarous* is not employed here in the sense of *uncivilized*, but as denoting roughness of manners. From the erection of the Golden Calf and the construction of the Tabernacle in the wilderness, it is clear that even at that early period of their history the Israelites were acquainted with both the useful and the fine arts. They would naturally acquire this knowledge from their long residence in Egypt, then the most civilized country in the world. It is true they were slaves; but their slavery was national, not personal, and more likely to produce irritability and vindictiveness of temper than any abasement of intellect. They had the advantage, too, of a leader who was "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians."

But this law would also end those dreadful personal contests which so frequently occur among all people in a state of semi-barbarity. No individual would be eager to rush into a contest when he knew that should he, even by an accidental blow, deprive his adversary of life, he would be immediately exposed to the danger of losing his own life by the hand of the avenger of blood, and would esteem himself fortunate if his punishment was no greater than banishment from his house, his lands, and his family, and confinement for an indefinite term in one of the cities of refuge. Hence pugilism and duelling, and some barbarous sports which exist in most European countries, had no existence in Judæa. This law, at the same time, gave free course to the effusion of revengeful feelings at the moment they were excited, and appeared to supply additional motives for their vigorous operation. This wise law thus tended to civilize the manners of the people, and to soften their martial and barbarous dispositions by the means which, at first view, would seem to promote their gratification.

Another law peculiar to the Jewish legislator was the restoration of land at the year of Jubilee. No Israelite could sell the freehold of his estate. This law was well calculated to preserve a degree of political liberty. The government of the Jews consisted at first of an aristocracy, afterwards of a monarchy. Though both of these forms appear to have been exempt from any political restraints, the exercise of their power was in a high degree regulated by the nature of their religion and the manners of the people. Nothing is so friendly to liberty as equality of property. This law, though it did not equalize property, maintained that degree of equality which existed at the division of the land immediately after the conquest; it prevented the rich from taking advantage of the temporary necessities of the poor; it prevented them from permanently increasing their estates at the expense of their neighbours. Every man having possessions to which he had an indefeasible claim, and which supplied him with all the necessaries and many of the luxuries of life, was independent of the wealthy neighbour, and not subject to his influence. Naboth rejected the entreaties of his sovereign; and there are several instances recorded of great freedom of speech exercised by persons of humble life towards the persons of their monarchs. The restoration of their lands at the year of Jubilee tended also to refine the manners of the different classes of society. In agricultural countries, individuals are not subject to a variety of fortune to so great a degree as in commercial countries. The rich are conscious of their security, and the poor are sensible of their dependence. These circumstances produce the corresponding dispositions of haughtiness and servility. But when the same person passes through the different gradations of society, the virtue he acquires in poverty counteracts the influence of those temptations to which he is exposed in prosperity, while, at the same time, the manners of prosperity remove the austerity

of poverty. In the Jewish commonwealth, a person might have a rich inheritance; he might expend it, and become a slave to his creditors; but at the year of Jubilee he was again put in possession of his estate.

I proceed now to answer the very powerful objection you would advance against the laws of Moses in reference to the subject of divorce. You cannot reconcile the Old and New Testaments on this point. You say, "If divorce be an offence against the Divine Being, it must have been an offence in ancient as well as in modern times. If it be not an offence, why make the laws of Christianity so unnecessarily strict?" You know that the object of these discussions is not theological, and, therefore, I am not bound to reconcile any of the Jewish laws to what may be considered the law or spirit of Christianity. In the present case, however, I have merely to observe, that the New Testament has presented a solution of the difficulty. Moses suffered it because of the hardness of their hearts. The laws of Moses were intended only for the Jewish nation, and were adapted only for them. Hence that martial and, in some degree, barbarous people were allowed to divorce their wives to prevent more fatal consequences—the murder of their wives, or indiscriminate connection between the sexes. You think this law bears very hard upon the females. Perhaps you think justly. But here we very probably overrate the evil by judging of the conduct of the Israelites by the rule of modern manners. A man might marry a young woman; if he did not like her, he might divorce her and marry another. She might be destined to the same fate; and thus he might, if he pleased, have a new wife every moon. The woman thus treated became widowed, deprived of honour and protection. All this is true as far as the laws are concerned, and might be practised by an individual. But suppose all men were to act thus, where could they procure a sufficient number of wives without marrying those who had been divorced? The principal counteractive of the evils which necessarily result from the practice of divorce consisted in the manners and circumstances of the people, resulting from the influence of their climate, their religion, their character, and their government. I will enumerate a few of those circumstances.

Recollect that every man was married. The influence of the climate, the honour and influence which was attached to a numerous family, and the abundant provision which was easily derived from their fields, induced the Israelites to marry exceedingly young. Whoredom and adultery were punished with death. That vitiated taste and that love of variety, produced by indiscriminate intercourse, had no existence in the minds of the Hebrew young men. Their wives were the wives of their youth, and the object of their earliest and purest attachment.

With us marriage is a tax upon our property. If a man marry without property, he must generally calculate on occupying a lower situation in society than if he continued in a state of bachelorship.

The only argument of a pecuniary nature that can be advanced in favour of marriage in our times is, that the expenses of marriage are more than counterbalanced by the expenses connected with an unmarried life of profligacy. This argument can apply to those only who are irregular in their morals. Among the ancient Jews the case was different. A married man stood a better chance of thriving in the world than a single man. As every man was a farmer, he was always certain of procuring food for his household, and the industry of his wife provided them with clothing.

In consequence of the universality of marriage, and the early age in which it was embraced, a family of daughters was not considered a heavy burden, such as to induce a father to give away his daughter with a view of relieving himself from an oppressive encumbrance. On the contrary, a large family of daughters was considered as a fortune. Instead of receiving a dowry with their wives, as is the custom with us, the husbands were compelled to purchase them of the ladies' fathers. In this case, therefore, a father would be scrupulous in giving his daughter to a man who had ill-used and divorced several preceding wives. Besides, the practice of buying their wives would render divorce less frequent. The husband derived no pecuniary benefit from the divorced wife. A wife was indispensable, and another could not be obtained without buying her.

Divorce could not take place without a regular legal process. It is natural, therefore, to suppose that when it did occur it was not the result of a hasty expression, or a momentary feeling, but the consequence of mature deliberation. After the divorce had been pronounced once, the wife could not return to her husband. This circumstance must have led the husband to deep consideration before he engaged in a measure he knew to be irrevocable.

It may also be observed, that divorce must have been rendered less frequent by the permission of polygamy. To procure a new wife, it was not necessary to divorce the one previously possessed. The first wife retained her rank, and her son, if the eldest, received his hereditary possession independent of the husband's will.

INDEX.

Abbeys of St. Albans, 160, 168; of Chertsey, 160; of Furmese, 161; and their wealth, 161.
Absolutions, 153.
Adam Smith, on the popish clergy, 166; on church riches, 174.
Addison, on the riches of the holy house of Loretta, 156.
Admonitory letters to superiors of convents and religious houses, 167.
Adultery, 427–430.
Advice to wealth-seekers, 81–5, 116–17, 119–20, 141–2.
Advocates at Athens, and duration of time for their speeches, 32.
Agriculture, a disadvantage it labours under in comparison with manufactures, 65.
Alexander the Great, 128.
Alexandria, Indian commodities brought to, 129; capture of, by the Mahometans, and supplies furnished to European trade, 135.
Amours of abbots and monks, 168.
Amusements of a merchant should correspond with his character or position as one, 48.
Animals, preservation of, in Egypt, and cause thereof, 9.
Appellations, past and present applied to congregations, 237.
Apologies, speakers and their comments on, 321.
Apostolic preaching, 234–9.
Arabia, commerce, with, 12, 131.
Archimedes, 50.
Areopagus, court of, 32.
Aristotle, his advice to young pleaders, 31.
Arts and sciences in connexion with commerce, 14–17, 52, 135.
Assurance of lives, 111–114.
Attica, Athens, and the Athenians, 30.
Aureus, the, 109.
Auricular confession, 195.

Balance of trade, in favour of Egypt, and cause thereof, 16,
Bambino, the, described, 163.
Banker, the business of 43, 75-8; in Greece, 43–4.
Banks and banking, 42, 75–8, 109.
Bankrupt, defined, 44.
Bar, pulpit, and senate; comparison between, in relation to eloquence, 250–9.
Barbarous; application of the term as not synonymous to savage, 509.
Barrenness and fertility of the earth contrasted by effects produced, 393.
Beggars and beggary consequent on monastic institutions, 164, 5, 6; Zosimus on, 169.
Benedictine monks, 161.
Benevolence, 333, 4.
Berenice founded by Ptolemy Philadelphus, and the commodities of India brought to, 129.
Blair, on reading sermons, 245.
Bottomry introduced by the Carthagenians, 79.
"Brass, the man of," 41.
Brass, money, 41–2, 107–8; imported by England in ignorance, 69.

Britain, sojourn of Romans in, 98.
Bullion, 15, 41, 78, 137–8.
Bulls, papal, sale of, 154.
Buying wives amongst the nations of antiquity, the Romans excepted, customary; and amongst non-Christian nations now, 416–17.

Canaan, or the Land of Promise, its superiority over Egypt as described by Moses, 8,
Canonization, 154.
Cape of Good Hope, discovery of, 137.
Capital, defined, 74–80, 87; effect of war on, 96.
Carlisle life-assurance tables, 112.
Carmelites the, and the apparel of the Virgin, 200.
Carrying trade, the, defined, 62.
Carthage, position of, extent, power, government, during the 600 years of its existence no instance of civil war; reason thereof; excelled in the arts and sciences; trade of, 56–7, 61-2; manufactures of, 66; importations or exportations of, 71–2; colonists of, 73; inhabitants loved justice, 80, esteemed wealth, 82, 85–6, and looked on commerce with respect, 86.
Castes, 18, 125.
Celibacy of the clergy, evils of, 179, 213.
Chairman, requirements for a, 329, 331.
Chastity, 424–5.
Children, parents' affection for considered, 438; treatment of, among nations of antiquity, 431.
Character, of the Egyptians, 20; Greeks, 44; Carthaginians, 80–87; Romans, 114; of the inhabitants of a country or city main cause of prosperity, 22; ascertained by handwriting, 118; an essential for a merchant, 87.
Charles the First and the clergy, 222.
Chastity of women, 424.
Christianity, its introduction into England, 215.
Church, Christian, and controversy, 212.
Cinnamon and cassia burnt by Nero at the funeral of Poppæa, 131.
Civilization, 25, 33, 52; through Roman conquests, 96.
Cleopatra, the ear-rings of, 132.
Climate, its effects and influences on countries and nations throughout the world, 355–382.
Clothes of the Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans, 123, 445.
Coin, substitution of for gold and silver bullion formerly paid and received by weight, 15.
Coinage, of Greece, 41; and resemblance to that of England, 42; Phœnicians or Lydians reputed as first inventors of, 78; of Tyre and Carthage, 78; of the Romans, 108; of pound weight of gold, 138. *See* Money, Gold, Silver, Copper, Brass.
Colonies and Colonization, 69, 73, 463.
Colossus at Rhodes, 36.
Colours, 57, 67.
Columbus, Christopher, discoveries by, 136–7.
Commerce arises from the variety of commodities different countries in the world possess, these being dependent chiefly on soil and climate for producing them; it promotes intercourse between nations; and creates national and individual wealth; is not followed merely as a profession, but is studied as a science, 1–3; of a country depends upon its productions, 5; its consumption which regulates its imports, 8; its geographical position, 12; its means of internal and external communication, 13; the state of the arts and sciences, 14; its laws, 17; and the genius and character of its inhabitants, 20; is promoted by the security of private property, 28; by an impartial administration of public justice, 29; by the formation of towns, 32; by the establishment of markets and fairs, 36; by institutions which facilitate the circulation of money, 41; extension of, as taught by Carthage, 57; held in high respect by Carthage, 86; of ancient Rome, 88; object of,

121 ; of the ancients with the East Indies, 121–142.
Commercial nations more honest than others in their dealings, 80; hints on correspondence and conversations, 118.
Communication, rapidity of, and its effect on commercial affairs, 51.
Companies, 80.
Comparison between the pulpit and the platform, 307.
Concubinage of the Roman Catholic clergy, 153, 168, 179.
Concubine, the, of sacred history explained, 422.
Confessions, Roman Catholic, 195.
Conquest, Norman, and the priestly influence, causing the, 219.
Conscience, and commerce, 120.
Constantinople, removal of seat of government from Rome to, 134.
Constitutional liberty, obstacles and impediments presented against by the political institutions of popery, which destroys that vigour of mind in which consists the excellence of national character, which breathes a persecuting spirit through the agency of a clergy, with contractedness of heart that fosters moroseness of temper and cruelty of disposition, warring against the feelings of humanity, and unconscious of the most tender emotions of social character, and which is alike injurious to religious liberty, 210–224.
Consumption, commercial meaning of the word, 8.
Contempt for trade in union with retirement from, 87.
Copper, coinage of, Athenians aversion to, 41 ; in England, 42 ; the smelting of, 65, 69 ; in mines of Spain worked by the Carthaginians, but existence of, in mines of Cornwall, unknown to them, 69.
Corinth, indebted wholly to commerce for her renown, wealth, and luxury, 35.
Corn-dealers at Athens, 30.
Cornwall, tin procured from, by the Phœnicians, 69.
Cost of raw and manufactured articles, 62, 72; of articles produced by public companies and individual enterprise, 80; of funeral obsequies amongst the Romans, 131 ; of pearls, 132 ; of gold, 138 ; of mercantile dishonesty, 120.
Costly ceremonials in Popish religion, 192–210.
Cotton, as a raw and as a manufactured article, 63.
Couriers, introduction of, 107.
Courtesans, 423–4.
Courts of law in Athens, 31.
Crassus obtains political power by means of his wealth, 105.
Credit, extent of, may be no proof of a want of capital, but the reverse, 75.
Crete, the largest of the Greek islands, 35 ; contained a hundred cities, 36 ; noted at one time as a considerable maritime power, and at all times as a nation of liars, 36.
Crime and its cause, Henry the Eighth's reign, 165.
Crusades, advance in civilization and refinement by means of the, 136; various, instigated by the Pope, 148 ; taxes levied during, 149.
Currency, depreciation of, 108.

Danes, success of their irruption into England attributed to the clergy, priests, and monks, 218.
De Souligny, on the expenditure of Roman Catholic ceremonials, 198 ; on Lent and other fastings, 203.
Death, capricious, may yet have his course marked out by the hand of science, 114.
Debt and debtors in Egypt, 18–20.
Decorations of churches, 197.
Deists, on Christian preachers, 308.
Deities, Pagan, 395.
Demosthenes, on oratory, 246, 248,
Denarius, the, 108.

Deposition of Sovereigns by the Pope, 146.
Depreciation of currency, 108.
Despotism, subverted by the Reformation, 223.
Discoveries, geographical, at the latter end of the sixteenth century, 136.
Dishonesty, 19; reflections on, 81–2, 120.
Dispensations, 152.
Division of the Church of Christ into sects and parties, considered, 315.
Divorce, in all ages and in all countries known to us, has, under certain circumstances, been permitted, 425–28.
Dominican monks, 165.
Dress, 123–5, 132, 445.
Duelling unknown among the heroic Greeks, and martial Romans, 110,
Dyes, 57, 66–8,

Earrings of Cleopatra, 132.
Earthenware imported by the Carthaginians into England, 68.
Egypt: historical notice of, productions of, 5–8; exports of, 6; imports of, 7–11; food and drink of, 6–8; religion, of, in union with its policy, 9; dress, 10; building, 11; foreign trade of, 13; internal means of communication, canals, roads, harbours, ships, 13; pyramids, 14–16; arts of, 14–17; money of, 15; laws and customs relative to commerce, 17; commercial character of its people defective, 20–22.
Eloquence, 246, 251–2, 259.
Embalming amongst the Egyptians, cause of, 11.
Estates, prohibition of sale and purchase of, under the feudal system, prejudicial to commerce, 17.
Europe in time of the Romans, 98; trade with India—see India.
Excommunication, kings under sentence of, 146; consequences of its infliction described, 148.
Exportation of bullion, and principles of the foreign exchanges, 137.
Extemporaneous addresses, 248.
Extortions of the Pope, 156.

Fast-days, 190; De Soulogny on, 204.
Fairs, 36, 39.
Female preachers, 259.
Fénélon, his description of an extemporaneous preacher, 245.
Ferryman of Loch Dearg, the, 196.
Fertility of soil, and results thereof, 391–5; affected by rivers and the vicinity of the sea, 396.
Festivals amongst the Egyptians, 18; the Greeks, 38; and the Romans, 125; Popish, 192, 196–7, 202.
Feudal system, 15, 17, 136.
First-fruits, 152.
Fishmongers at Athens, 31.
Flanders thread, remanufacture of, 63.
Fools and rogues synonymous, 81.
Forests, 400–4.
Forms of government, 463.
Forum Greek, or market-place, 36.
France, number of clergy in, before the Revolution, 170; civil and ecclesiastical tyranny in, from the banishment of the Huguenots, or Protestants, till the Revolution of 1789, 224.
Franciscan order of monks, 165.
Frauds and impositions of the Romish clergy, 208.
Friends, Society of, 265.
Funeral tribunals of the Egyptians, 19; obsequies of the Romans, 130; piles of Sylla and Poppæa, 131.

Gallon, contents and weight of the, 40.
Gambling and mining, 403.
Games — Olympic, Pythian, Nemean, Isthmian, 38.
Geometry invented by the Egyptians, 14.
Genoa, 135–6.
Gilbart, Rev. Thomas, on the effects of preaching in the Christian world, 232.
Glass, manufacture of, 64.
Gold, in bar or bullion amongst the Egyptians, 15, 41; first mention of, in its employment as money, 15; ornaments of, 15, 16; idols of, 16; not abundant in Greece, 42; in Rome, 108;

in England, 42; only a commodity; exportation of, 137–8; curious destiny probably attendant on a portion of ancient, 139. See Coin, Coinage.
Good, doing it by stealth, when and where objectionable, 334.
Goodness of God towards His creatures, 139.
Government, objects and forms of, 463; monarchial, 466; aristocratic, 472; democratic, 475; republican, 477; and laws of the Jews, 505.
Greeks, the, in their aboriginal state, 25; commercial character of, 44; were superstitious, and notoriously untruthful, 45; litigious, and deficient in habits of business, 46; fond of amusement, 47; their proficiency in the fine arts, logic, and geometry, 50.
Gymnasium, in Athens, 34.

Hailes, in Gloucestershire, the miracle of the blood of Christ, 209.
Handwriting, 118.
Happiness: the promotion of it amongst others confers the purest of pleasures upon ourselves, 24; and intellectual and moral worth secure it in prosperity or adversity, 141
Henry VII., power conferred by, on barons and other landowners to sell estates beneficial to commerce, 17–18, 223.
Henry VIII., as an absolute monarch, 223.
Hidden treasure in the East, 138.
History, definition of, 351; and biography, the study of each, respectively considered, 459.
Holidays, 47–8, 203. See Festivals.
Honesty and honour, 114, 120.
Huguenots, or Protestants in France, 224.
Human mind, powers, and achievements of, 51, 141.
Husband and wife, relation between, 406.

Idleness amongst the Egyptians, 20; esteemed disgraceful among the Greeks 31; national, and its consequences; and of the monks, 158.
Ignorance in merchants of other countries than their own may involve them in serious losses, 51; of the Popish clergy in England before the Reformation, 176.
Importations, regulated by the consumption of a country, 8; a hurtful sort of commerce, 9; of the Egyptians, 7, 11, 12.
Impositions and exactions of foreign monks in England, 154.
Increase of value from the raw material manufactured into articles, illustrated by cotton, steel, lead, and bar iron, 63, 64.
India, commerce of the ancients, with, 121–142; history of the trade to, previous to the time of Alexander the Great, 126; and the trade with, from then to the conquest of Egypt by the Romans, 128; from the conquest of Egypt by the Romans to its conquest by the Mahometans, 130; from the conquest by the Mahometans to the discovery of the passage by the Cape of Good Hope, 135; chief articles of export—spices and aromatics, 130;—precious stones, 131;—silk, 132; principal objections to trade with, 137–8; hidden treasure in, 138.
Indulgences granted by Pope, 152–4; Spanish ship captured with 2,000,000 of, sent by Pope to king of Spain, 134.
Industry, the road to wealth, 116; stimulated by a demand for luxuries, 123.
Infanticide, permission of, would increase population, 433.
Influence of wealth, 85; of preaching as a means of imparting religious instruction to unenlightened nations, 293; of the platform, 312.
Inheritance, 440.
Inscription on one of the pyramids, 20.
Inspired speeches recorded in the Bible, 248.

Insurance on ships, 111; on life, 111-114
Interdict, popish, defined, and consequences described, 147.
Interest for money at Athens, 43, 110.
Isaiah, small bone of the prophet, shown at Sens, 210.
Islands, advantages of, 59; and love of liberty inherent in islanders, 400.

Jews, polygamy amongst, 417; marriages of eldest daughters before younger, 421; concubinage, 422; infants, exposure of, on banks of rivers, 431–2; numerous offspring desired by, 434; names, 437; registry of births, 438; departures from chastity and consequences, 424; divorce, 426; clothing, 445; slavery, 455; tribes, 462. *See* Government and laws of the, further considered, 506–12.
Joint-stock companies, 80.
Jubilee, year of, established by Pope, 155.
Judges in Athens, 31.
Julius Cæsar, conquest of Egypt by, 130; the pearl presented by, to Servilia, 132.

King John, excommunication of, 146.
Kings of England and the see of Rome, the most devoted to it,—the most impotent, the most opposed,—the most intellectual, 223.
Kissing, the asserted antipathy of an Egyptian man to bestow on a Phœnician woman, doubtful from its improbability, 21.
Knowledge, pursuit and diffusion of, 23. —a criterion for ascertaining the existence of, in a country, 107; pursuit of, in union with that of wealth, 141.

Labour and the Sabbath, 48; and manufactures, 65–6; and supply, 72; of slaves, 104; loss of, in England prior to the Reformation, 158–9; and evil effects of monastic institutions on, 164–5, 191–2; and wages, 444.
Lace, when ten times the price of standard gold, weight for weight, 63.
Latimer, Bishop, on the pulpit of the Romish Bishops, 233.
Laws and government of the Jews, 506.
Lawyers, Aristotle's advice to, 31.
Laziness of the monks proverbial, 158–9.
Lazzaroni, at Naples, 166.
Lead, worth of a pound weight manufactured into type, 64.
Leaden tokens as coin, 42.
Leather, early application of it to use, 68; money at Carthage, 78.
Legends of Popery, 211.
Letters, conveyance of, 106–7; commercial rule for, 118.
Lent and its observances, 204–8.
Liberty, constitutional, promoted by the Reformation, 210–224.
Libra, the, 107.
Linen, manufacture of, by the Egyptians, 6, 66; in Ireland, 66; apparel amongst the Romans and moderns, 123.
Literary and scientific institutions, among the most effective means of improving the character of a people, 23.
Loretta, holy house of, 156.
Loan banks of the Romans, 110.
Luxuries of the Romans, 99–101, 124, 130; definition of, 122; origin of, effects of, a taste for, 122–4; importation of, from India, 125; as provided or permitted by Providence, 139.

Maiden Bradley, the Prior of, 168.
Maker, a, defined, 63.
Manufactured articles, 62; *et seq.*, 72.
Manufacturer, defined, 63.
Manufactures, establishment of, 65.
Manufacturing nations, rise to wealth, 63.
Markets, 36, 39.
Marriage, a civil contract amongst the ancients, 406; amongst the Jews, 407; amongst the Romans on the establishment of Christianity; performance of ceremony by a priest unknown till the year 1200, 407; in Scotland; in Persia; during protectorate of Oliver

Cromwell; during French Revolution amongst the Quakers, 407.
Marine insurance, 111.
Masses, profits to the Roman Catholic clergy derived from, 193–4.
Masters and servants, 443–447.
Measures and weights, 39–41.
Mendicant orders, 165, 170, 208.
Merchants, and others seeking wealth, are citizens of the world, and able to promote the happiness of nations, 21; advice to, 114, 116–17, 119–20, 141.
Mercury, the deity. 110.
Michaelis on commerce, 37.
Military men and merchants, 118; eloquence, 251.
Mines, possession of, by a country, and results, 400–4.
Missionaries and the difficulties encountered by them in the propogation of Christianity, 300.
Monarchial governments, are of three kinds, 478: absolute, 494; legislative, 495; limited, 502.
Monastic institutions, pernicious effects of; deprive a country of labour, 158; absorb large portion of national wealth, 160; productive of poverty and wretchedness among lower orders of society, 164; supported and extended in England the dominion of the Pope, 166; effects in other countries of, 169; in Spanish colonies, and fatal consequences, 170; in Canada; in Russia; in Spain, 172, 192; in England, and bequeathment of land to, prohibited, 172.
Money, of the Egyptians, or substitution for, 15, 41; of the Greeks, 41–2; of the Phœnicians, who are reputed the first inventors of; Tyre; Carthage, 78; of the Romans, 107; of England, its resemblance to that of Greece; silver, gold, and copper coined into, 42; mints or banks tend to circulation of, 41; is distinct and not synonymous with wealth, 138; paper and leather money, 78; success, dependent upon, 332.
Monitory letter to the Abbot of St. Albans, 168.
Monks, the most considerable orders of, before the Reformation, 165; profligacy and crimes of, 153, 168, 176, 182.
Monsoon, 134.
Montesquieu, on the barrenness and fertility of the soil, 393; on slavery, 451–2.
Morals, public, and monastic institutions, 167.
Mortmain, statute of, 172.
Mountains and their mountainous districts, with the character and attributes, &c., in relation to inhabitants thereof, considered, 382–390.
Murders, by the clergy in Henry the Third's reign, 182.

Names, 437.
Nantes, revocation of edict of, and results, 224.
Natal festivities, 437.
National wealth and monastic institutions, 160.
Navigation, 56, 58–62, 133.
Necessaries, primary and secondary, 121.
Nomadic, or shepherd state of society, 505.
Norman Conquest brought about by the Popish religion, 219.
Northampton and Carlisle life-insurance tables, 112.
Novice, the, 169.

Objections, the principal, to the Indian trade, in times ancient and modern, 137.
Obolus, the, 41.
Oratorical delivery, 246–9.
Owners and slaves, 448–58.

Paganism and Popery opposed to the exercise of the intellect, 304.
Palmyra, intercourse by land by way of, to India, opened by the Romans, 133.
Paper money and leather money, possible relation between, 78.

Parents and children, 430–443.
Parting words for remembrance, 346.
Partnerships render capital more productive, 79, 80.
Patriotism, 115.
Peace, advantages of, to trade, 97, 120.
Pearls, preference of the Romans for, over all other precious things, as ornaments, 132.
Penance, of Henry IV. of Germany, 149, 195.
Pence, St. Peter's, 156.
Philosophy, definition of, 351.
Philosophy of History, the, *Preface* to, 349; Introduction to, 351.
Philosophy of Geographical History, 355; of Domestic History, 404; of Political History, 460; and *Appendix* thereto, 506.
Philosophy of Political History, 159.
Philosophical instruments are modern 50.
Phœnicia: position, government, chief cities, 55; excelled in woollen manufactures, 66.
"Piece," the, supposed to be the same as the shekel, 15.
Pilgrimages, 155, 196.
Pins, manufacture of, 64.
Plains, and the character, attributes, &c., of the inhabitants thereof, 390, 391.
Platform, the, comparison between, and the pulpit, 307; influence of, 312; imperfections of, 320.
Plato, was engaged in trade, 34.
Pliny, on the offerings made of precious substances to the dead in heaps, and to the gods in grains only, 131.
Political power of Crassus and other Romans, obtained by wealth, 105; economy, 352.
Polygamy, not permitted by the ancient Greeks generally, nor among the Romans; but subsequently introduced or common amongst the patriarchs—was placed under some restriction by Moses, permitted in Egypt, Babylon, and Persia; allowed by Mahomet, permitted in China, a chief reason of, in Oriental countries, and Solomon's seven hundred wives and three hundred concubines, 418; Paley, on evils of, 418; and Bruce and Madan in favour of, 419, 420; is forbidden in New Testament, 421.
Poor, the real, and the mendicant frairs, 208.
Pope, prince of the kings of the earth previous to the Reformation, 145; sovereigns deposed by, enumerated, 146; and excommunicated, 146, 147; wars instigated by, 148, 149; presentation to church livings by, 149–151; appeals to, 151; first-fruits and tenths of England claimed by, 152; dispensations and indulgences granted by, 152; year of jubilee instituted by, 155; extortions of, 156; exactions by, from clergy in England, 157; bull of Innocent the Eighth to reform manners of and morals of monks in England, 167; grant indulgences to clergy to keep mistresses, 153–179; consequences of a belief in the infallibility of, 211; the fatal blow to influence of, in England, 222.
Popery, tenets of, 211.
Poppæa, funeral of, 131.
Pound, the word and meanings of, 107–9; weight of gold coined into sovereigns, 138.
Poverty and wretchedness produced by monastic institutions, 164–6, 174.
Pray and Sapwell, nunneries of, and the Abbot of St. Albans, 168.
Preacher the, or "Essays on Preaching," 225–306.
Preachers: Our Saviour, the Apostles, 230–234, 276; Moses, Joshua, Samuel, Ezra, 248; hireling to promote sale of Popish indulgences, 232; the Romish Bishops as; and Latimer's lament for want of proper and powerful; Whitfield, Wesley as, 233.
Preaching, objects of, 227; effects of, 230; apostolical, 234; textual, 239; superiority of, as a means of impart-

ing religious instruction to unenlightened nations, and its Divine authority, 273; its efficiency, 281; its influence, 293; its adaptation, 301. *See* Preacher, Preachers.
Precious metals, 15, 69; exportation of, 137–8. *See* Money, Coin, Bullion, Gold, Silver.
Precious stones, 131.
Primitive Christian Church and its loss of simplicity in the time of Constantine, 232.
Prior of Maiden Bradley, 168.
Private property, the laws of Lycurgus abolished, 29.
Productions of Egypt, 6.
Profits of bankers; of manufacturers, 64.
Property tax, levied during the Crusades, 149.
Proportion of monks to population, 159.
Prosperity of a country promoted by banking, 77, 78.
Protestantism has rendered the Papal yoke lighter in countries where Popery exists, 145.
Ptolemy, a general of Alexander, acquiring possession of Egypt, 129.
Public ways, Roman, 106.
Pulpit, the, and the Bar, and the Senate, 250; comparison between the, and the Platform, 307.
Pun, mercantile, by Lord Ellenborough, 119.
Punic: meaning and application of the word, 57.
Pyramids, 16; inscription on one, 20.

Quarries of marble, Egyptian, 5.
Questions of morality, taken merely in a commercial point of view, to be guarded against, 120.

Raw material, the, and manufactured article, 62, *et seq.*
Reading, the relic of the Angel's wing, and bits of the True Cross at, 209.
Reading sermons, 243–50.
Reformation, supremacy of the Pope prior to, 145–158; and monastic institutions, 169–173; has diminished the wealth of the clergy, 174, and the number of, 177, and abolished celibacy of, 179, has rendered property of, liable to be taxed by the civil power, 180, and subjected them to the jurisdiction of the civil courts, 181, excluding them from holding offices in the state, 184; has diminished the jurisdiction of the bishops and other ecclesiastical courts, 186, abolished the right of sanctuary, 187–192, and diminished the number of holy days, 189; social effects of, generally, 143–224.
Registries of marriage among the Romans, 425, of birth among the Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans, 438; and moderns, 439.
Relics and consecrated articles sent to England from Rome, 154, 163, 200, 209, 217.
Religious controversy, advantages of, during every era of the Christian Church, but excluded by Popery, 212; instruction to unenlightened nations aided materially by preaching 273; societies, and construction of 331; and administration of same, 341.
Republican governments are, of their kinds, aristocratical, 477–479; democratical, 482; mixed, 484; general remarks upon those of the United States of America and others, their continuance or downfal, 489–93.
Resemblance between nations and individuals as to unproductive labour and capital, illustrated, 96.
Retirement from trade, error of, 87.
Rhodes, remarkable for its climate, wines, Colossus, 36.
Rivers, advantages of, to a country, demonstrated, 395–400.
Rivalry in pursuit of wealth, honour, power, fame, and knowledge, 141.
Roads, in Egypt, 13; Roman, 106; the surest of all, to arrive at wealth, 116.

Rogues, the error of supposing them clever men, 81.
Romans, ancient, as an agricultural people, 69; as a warlike nation, 93; as people of an extended empire, 97; in Britain, Spain, Gaul, 98; their taste for luxuries, 99–130, their institutions—of slavery, 103–119,—travelling,—conveyance of letters,—public ways, 106.—couriers, buying, selling, money, banking, 107, and insurances, 111; character of—were honourable, 114, patriotic, 115, grave, methodical, and systematic, 116; not loquacious, 117, warlike, 118, cruel, 119.
Rome, ancient commerce of, 88–120. *See* Romans.
Rood of Grace at Boxley, or Bexley, in Kent, the miracle of the, 209.
Royal marriages, 415.
Rules of conduct, 114, 115, 116, 141; on speaking and writing, 118.

Sabbath, observance of, 48–50.
St. Albans, Abbey of, and its riches, 160; Abbot of, his crimes, and those of the monks, 168.
St. Anthony, festival of, 196-7.
St. Paul, and his powers in preaching 235, 297.
St. Peter's Pence, 156.
St. Thomas à Becket, offerings at shrine of, 162; disputes between, and Henry III., 182.
Sale of land prohibited in the feudal times, 17; of indulgences, 152–4; of wives, 440.
Salerno, monasteries at, 166.
Salic or Salique law of succession, 272 441.
Sanctuary, 187, 192.
Saving of money by the Reformation demonstrated, 193–9, 202–5, 210.
Sea, beneficial influence of, from its vicinity to a country, 395–400.
Senate, pulpit, and bar; comparison between, in relation to eloquence, 250–9.
Sermons, reading, 243–50.
Sestertium and Sestertius, 109.
Shekel, the, 15.
Ships, of Egypt, 13; difference between those of ancient and modern times, 59; insurance on, 111. *See* Navigation.
Sidon, 55.
Silk: as a production of India, in great demand at Rome, 132–5.
Silkworms procured by the Venetians from Sicily, 135.
Silver, usually employed as money in ancient times, 15; in Egypt, 15; in Greece, 41; in England, 42; in Rome, 108.
Sins, remission of, by papal assumption 153–6.
Slavery, 103, 119, 448–58.
Social effects of the Reformation, 143–224.
Societies, religious constitution of, 331; and administration of, 341.
Society, progress of, 462.
Solon, was engaged in mercantile pursuits, 34.
Sovereigns deposed by Popes, 146; the weak and strong-minded of England and the Papal See, 223.
Spain, the mines of, worked by the Carthaginians, 69; the inquisition in, 179; loss of labour in, 192; ecclesiastical tyranny in, prior to the Revolution of 1789, 224.
Spanish colonies, monastic institutions in, and fatal consequences resulting, 170–2.
Sparta, social institutions of, and the laws of Lycurgus, 29.
Speakers, 248;—and their apologies, 321;—reading extracts, 322; style of address—injudicious allusions, 325; captious or sarcastic remarks on those preceding them, 325;—discussing party politics, 326;—excessive compliments to the female auditory, 326; —speaking too long, 328, and flattery to a chairman, 338.
Speculations, bad, 51.
Speculative history, 461.
Speeches. *See* Platform.

Spices and aromatics, 130.
Spinning, a female occupation amongst all ancient nations, 66.
Spinster, origin of name, 66.
Stater, the, a Greek gold coin, 42, 139.
Steel, when three hundred times dearer than standard gold, weight for weight, 63.
Sumptuary laws, 124–5.
Sunday. *See* Sabbath.
Supremacy of the Pope, 143.
Sylla, funeral of, 131.
Syracuse, capital of Sicily, remarkable for its extensive commerce; port of; architecture of, 35.

Table dainties amongst the Romans, 100.
Talent, Egyptian, weight and worth of, 16; Greek, 42.
Tanning, of the ancients, 68.
Tautology in preaching and writing, 294.
Taxes, during the Crusades, 149; on the clergy by the Pope, 157; levied by the Pope in Edward III.'s reign exceeded five times those which were paid to the king, 158.
Temples, formerly employed as banks, 43.
Tenets of Popery, 211.
Tenure of land under the feudal system —unfriendly to commerce, 17, 18.
Textual preaching, 240.
Theban preservation of children, an exception to other nations of antiquity, 431.
Tin, Carthaginians obtain, from Cornwall and Spain, 69.
Trade in Egypt, 18; none but an honest, should be followed, 119; none formerly carried on between the Mahometan and Christian nations, 135, though eventually by the Venetians, 136; increase of, in union with industry, since the Reformation, 159.
Trade winds, discovery of, by the Romans, 133.
Transmigration of souls, a doctrine of the Egyptians, 9, 11.
Treasure, concealing, 42.
Trial of a debtor after death before the "funeral tribunal" in Egypt, 19.
Tribes of Israel, history of, 462, 506–8.
"Trojan Horse," the, a celebrated Roman dish called, 100.
Truth, the only standard of, 232.
Tyre, position of, 55; navigation, commerce, and government of, 56; manufactures of, 56, 66; ships of, 61; dyes of, 57, 67.

Unenlightened nations, and effects of preaching to, 301.
Untruthfulness, comments on the evils of, generally, and in regard to the mercantile character especially, 46.—*See* Greeks, Cretans.
Usurpations of the clergy, 173.
Usury laws, none at Athens, 44.

Value of pearls in ancient times, 131; of cotton, steel, lead, and bar-iron, manufactured from the raw material, 63, 64.
Vasco de Gama, discoveries by, 137.
Venice and the Venetians, 135–6.
Vestments of the Virgin Mary, 156, 200, 209–211.

Wages, rate of, 72, 81, 96, 444.
Wealth, desire of, a virtue or a vice, according to the motives from whence it proceeds, 81–2; advantages of, and erroneous dicta by pseudo moralists and dreaming poets, 83; desire of, associated with prudence and economy, 84; was highly esteemed by the Carthaginians, 85–6; instances of abuse of, 105; the finger-posts on the road to, 116; is not synonymous with mere money, 138; importance of, in its union with knowledge, 141.
War, its influence on commerce, 94–97; in support of the dignity of the Holy

See, ceases in England at the Reformation, 148.
Weaving, 66.
Weights and measures, 15, 40, 107–9, 138.
Wesley, an excellent commercial rule laid down by, 118; his preaching, 233.
West Indies, accidental discovery of, 137.
Whitfield, the preacher, 233.
Wives, sale and purchase of, 440. *See* Polygamy, Concubines.
Wine, "the blood of demons," 9.
Wisdom, the principal thing as securing happiness, 142.
Women, Egyptian, traded, while men minded domestic matters, 18; Phœnician, stated not to have been kissed by Egyptian men, and improbability thereof, 21; preaching by; Spartan, 29; chastity of, 424.
Woollen, manufacture of, by the Phœnicians, 66.

THE END.

LONDON: PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, STAMFORD STREET AND CHARING CROSS.